

JPRS-UKO-85-010

3 June 1985

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 4, March 1985

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

3 June 1985

USSR REPORT

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 4, March 1985

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

CONTENTS

K. U. Chernenko's Speech to the Voters of the Kuybyshev Electoral District in Moscow	1
To the Leaders of the Argentine Movement "Appeal of 100 in the Name of Life" (K. U. Chernenko)	10
For a Nuclear-Free Northern Europe (K. U. Chernenko)	12
For the Sake of Maintaining Peace on Earth (K. U. Chernenko)	14
A Party That Firmly Knows Its Road: On the Occasion of Publication of K. U. Chernenko's Book "On the Road of Perfecting Developed Socialism"	17
A Decisive Link in Party Leadership (G. Razumovskiy)	32
Moral Significance of the October Revolution (Mikh. Lifshits)	47
The PZPR and the Leninist Ideological Legacy (Marian Orzechowski)	61
At the Head of the Victorious People (A. Yepishev)	74

"And Our Girl Came in a Military Greatcoat..." (Yuliya Drunina)	88
Glorious Son of Latin America (N. Leonov)	96
Strategy of Deepening Cooperation of CEMA Countries (B. Ladygin, O. Chukanov)	109
The Socialist Community in World Politics (N. Lebedev)	123
World of Capitalism Under the Burden of Debts (N. Shmelev)	136
Regular Enrollment in Republic and Interoblast Higher Party Schools ...	149

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 4
March 1985

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author(s) :

Editor(s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : March 1985

Signed to press : 27 February 1985

Copies : 952,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1985

K. U. CHERNENKO'S SPEECH TO THE VOTERS OF THE KUYBYSHEV ELECTORAL DISTRICT IN MOSCOW

PM222120 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 1985 (signed to press 27 Feb 85) pp 3-9

[Speech delivered on 22 February 1985]

[Text] Dear Comrades:

I express my sincere gratitude to the working people of Kuybyshevskiy Rayon in Moscow, who again nominated me as candidate to run for the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR. I will do my best to justify this great trust, this high honor.

Elections to organs of Soviet power are a direct and vivid manifestation of the political will of the people. And we, communists, naturally are proud that the Soviet people name, first of all, representatives of the Leninist party--the leading force of our society--as their candidates. This is convincing evidence of the support of the policy of the CPSU by the working people, evidence of the inviolable unity between the party and the people.

One year ago, at the meeting with the electorate of your district, we had a detailed discussion about key questions of domestic and foreign policies and about the course of implementation of the decisions taken by the 26th CPSU Congress. We spoke of the achievements and difficulties of the past years. We spoke of what we were going to do to make our motherland even stronger and more beautiful, to make the life of every Soviet citizen better and more meaningful, and so that there may be peace, a durable and stable peace.

That is why I would like first of all to inform you of what we have managed to accomplish over the past year, a year of extensive and strenuous work for all of us.

You know full well that the party's Central Committee and the Central Committee Politburo worked actively in a very wide field. Much attention was devoted to the economy, to improving management and raising the efficiency of the national economy, developing the creative initiative and political activity of the masses, and perfecting ideological work. Serious measures are known to have been taken to strengthen discipline, law and order. But still, let me tell you straight, there are not enough of them. In this sphere, we

have acted and will act in full compliance with the decisions of the November 1982, June 1983 and February 1984 CPSU Central Committee plenums.

At the same time, we have gone right into dealing with a number of other very important questions of our life. Improvement of the work of the soviets and the school reform, perfection of the party guidance of the Komsomol, energizing people's control, land reclamation and enhancing the social function of literature and the arts are but a few of the problems in the solution of which we have directed our efforts.

Understandably, the work of the party, as you see, is becoming ever more diversified. This is required by the strategic course of the CPSU, a course toward the all-around perfecting of socialism built in our country.

This is required by the specific features of the present political movement. We have launched preparations for the 27th Party Congress, the congress that is called upon to play a special role in the history of our party and the destinies of our country. For it is precisely the 27th Congress that is to adopt a new draft of the party program.

This will be the program for perfecting developed socialism, a program for a great constructive endeavor that will make it possible to fully translate our socialist ideals into life. This also means to bring closer the possibility of fulfilling the tasks directly linked with building communism, which was and remains our lofty goal.

It means to bring about a sharp rise in labor productivity and material well-being of the people with all-around flourishing of spiritual culture and to ensure complete and universal assertion of social justice inherent in our system with its key principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." Such are the tasks of historic significance which should, in our opinion, be reflected in the new draft of the program of the CPSU, work on which is now entering the final stage.

Someone, perhaps, may say: Aren't we getting carried away by formulating long-term tasks, while far from all current problems in this country have been resolved to meet the standards of developed socialism?

Here is how I would answer this question. It is possible to solve short-term, urgent problems successfully only by having a clear perspective for the future, clearly realizing the scale of future work. The confidence that we will cope with that task is based on scientifically substantiated, realistic forecasts. This confidence is based on fully realistic recent achievements, on the results which we have achieved, overcoming certain negative tendencies in our development.

Let us turn to the economic results of the past year. They speak of further steady progress of industry, of a substantial buildup of production capacities in key sectors of the national economy and of the growth of our social wealth. I will not quote figures. They have been published in the press. I would like to draw your attention to only one indicator.

I am referring to labor productivity. Higher labor productivity accounts for almost the entire increase in the national income. From this follows an important conclusion: The Soviet economy is ever more firmly establishing itself on the track of intensive development. This is our prime concern, both for today and tomorrow, for the present level of labor productivity, comrades, cannot satisfy us at all.

To produce more with less cost--such, it would seem, is the formula of intensive economic growth. However, all of us know how difficult it is to translate that into reality. A host of problems immediately arise here--organizational, technical, moral and psychological. We are dealing with them more confidently now.

The working people are showing a higher sense of responsibility for their work. Last year, for example, enterprises met their obligations concerning mutual deliveries to a higher degree than in all previous years of the five-year plan. Tens of thousands of work collectives energetically undertook to economize raw material and fuel. This is one of the most pressing problems.

All of this is tangible evidence that our economy is advancing to a qualitatively new stage of its development. In this process, there are achievements which are particularly gratifying to us. Among these, I am gratified to note the successes of the working people of your rayon. I have before me the data for the first 4 years of the current five-year plan. Labor productivity in your rayon's industry increased by over 50 percent faster than planned. Here are data for last year. You, just like the country's other collectives, undertook to raise labor by at least 1 percent in excess of the plan but raised it by more than 2 percent. A remarkable result. Well done, comrades!

The working people of Moscow as a whole are working energetically in the 11th Five-Year Plan. They gave their word to fulfill it ahead of time, and we all know that the Muscovites are good at keeping their word. It was no accident that, on the strength of the results of socialist competition for 1984, Moscow and its Kuybyshev Rayon have been awarded the Challenge Red Banners of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, the AUCCTU and the Komsomol Central Committee.

It is known, comrades, that a rise in the people's well-being is the ultimate goal of all our efforts in the economic sphere. We make continuous headway in this field from year to year.

Take, frankly speaking, such an urgent matter as the satisfaction of the population's growing demand for durable, high-quality goods. The fundamental line towards the priority development of the industries which manufacture consumer goods has been consistently sustained throughout 4 years of the current five-year period.

We set such a task previously, too, but by no means were we always able to accomplish it. A real and practical change for the better has now taken place.

It is good that heavy industry sectors are more actively joining in the solution of this question. Last year their share in the manufacture of consumer goods grew up to 30 percent. The social as well as the political meaning of this is clear to everyone. Our powerful industry is working directly for the good of people to an even greater extent.

At the same time, we all know that improving the quality of our consumer goods remains quite a topical concern.

It is gratifying to note successes achieved in resolving the housing problem. In 1984 alone, 2 million well-appointed apartments were built. Forty million people improved their living conditions over the first 4 years of the current five-year plan. There is every reason to believe that the housing construction program, the largest one in the history of five-year plans, will be not only implemented but exceeded as well.

For a number of years we have been consistently taking measures to improve the working and living conditions of women who have children and increasing benefits to large families. Among our top-priority concerns are an accelerated construction of nurseries and kindergartens, and increasing the production and improving the quality of goods for children.

We devote unflagging attention to building up the health of Soviet people. The party takes a broad view of this task. It encompasses efforts to make working conditions healthier, to protect the environment, to develop a truly mass physical culture movement and, of course, first and foremost, to perfect medical services to the population.

You know, comrades, that the party and our state are making more exacting demands upon the work of the health-service bodies and are consistently working to overcome the serious drawbacks existing in this field. At the same time, we also see well the need to improve the working and living conditions of medical personnel. In particular, the question of starting the implementation of measures next year to raise salaries for the health-care workers is now under consideration. This will be undoubtedly a big step in the social policy of the party because this concerns the well-being of more than 5 million people.

In a nutshell, a lot of good is being done for people. But, frankly speaking, much more should be done. What hinders that?

The answer, I think, is clear. The living standard and quality of life in our society rise from year to year commensurately with our work. No less, but no more either. This means that in order to raise the people's well-being more rapidly, it is essential to improve our work in all sectors more quickly and thoroughly.

This is what the party and its Central Committee strive for. They persistently steer matters to securing a real turning point in the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and a rise in the efficiency of the Soviet economy before the end of the 1980s.

In this connection, I want to emphasize the following. Everyone, one can say, has broadly realized the need for qualitative changes in our economic work. What is needed is more resolutely to effect these changes in practice. It is essential to master more boldly and without delays everything useful and valuable that has already been produced for us by the economic experiments and advanced forms and methods of economic management. This is even more essential, for we are in the concluding year of the current five-year plan. In order to worthily attain the planned goals of the period, I repeat once again, a large amount of persistent work with initiative will be needed.

Planning and management, the economic mechanism and the system of remuneration of labor--all should be now perfected without procrastination. In our calendar there is no time specifically allotted for this kind of work.

Many interesting ideas were expressed and sound mandates issued on how to improve the work of our power and economic management bodies during the election campaign. The task of the soviets is to study and generalize them thoroughly and with the utmost attention to study and in practical affairs.

Comrades, little time separates us from the 40th anniversary of the victory in the Great Patriotic War. The heroic Soviet people under the leadership of the Leninist party defended their socialist fatherland in the hardest battle against the Hitlerite hordes, brought freedom to Europe and saved world civilization from fascist barbarism. This feat of arms will never fade!

We revere the memory of those who died for the freedom and independence of our motherland. We have considered and still consider it our high duty to constantly care for the veterans of the Great Patriotic War, for their health and living conditions.

In connection with the 40th anniversary of the victory, it seems appropriate to emphasize again the entire importance of purposeful and efficient work for the patriotic education of working people, especially of the young generation. The everlasting purpose of our entire ideological work is to cultivate in Soviet people love for the motherland and unshakable readiness to defend the socialist gains.

Availing myself of this opportunity, I want to greet our servicemen and all of you, comrades, on the occasion of the approaching holiday--Soviet Army and Navy Day. Soviet people may rest assured: The party and state have done and will do everything for our Armed Forces to be able reliably to protect the peaceful life of the people and for the country's defense capacity to be always at a proper level.

Comrades:

We, the generation of today, are first and foremost duty-bound to prevent a new world conflagration, to save life on earth.

The present difficult international situation necessitates high vigilance, firmness, restraint and, certainly, vigorous actions to improve the international climate.

It is of great benefit to the cause of peace and international security that there is the community of socialist states in the world, consistently upholding the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence in the international arena. Throughout the past years we spared no effort to ensure that cooperation of the countries of socialism should strengthen and broaden in all fields.

Strength in unity was the old watchword of the working class movement. Today it is fully applicable to the fraternal socialist countries.

We jointly foiled the designs of the imperialists to exhaust socialism economically. In recent years our countries have made further headway in their socioeconomic development, and what is important, we are becoming economically less vulnerable to external effects. This, in particular, is the aim of the decisions of last year's summit conference of CEMA member countries, on whose implementation we are all working now. The process of socialist economic integration is picking up speed and the international socialist division of labor is gaining in depth. Every individual fraternal country and the whole socialist community benefit from it.

By acting jointly we have prevented the United States and its allies from upsetting the military-strategic parity in their favor. This is going to happen in the future too, for our fraternal alliance is indestructible. The 30th anniversary of the Warsaw Pact is to be celebrated soon. I can inform you that all the parties to the pact have declared in favor of extending it. While the aggressive imperialist NATO bloc continues to function, we need, as in the past, a concerted, well-coordinated peaceable foreign policy and a reliable shield for peaceful labor.

We are for enhancing the role and influence of the world socialist system as a whole in the international arena. In this connection we attach much significance to normalizing relations with the People's Republic of China. Useful steps were taken in this respect last year. Although we cannot but see the continuing serious political differences, we would like to hope that Soviet-Chinese relations will be further favorably developed by the efforts of both sides.

We cooperate with all peaceable forces on earth in strengthening international security. In this day and age this means, in particular, cooperation with the freedom-loving independent states of the former colonial and semicolonial world. All such states--from great India to small Benin, and from neighboring Arab countries to distant republics of Central and South America--are our natural and like-minded partners when it comes to the defense of the rights of the peoples and a peaceful future for mankind. We treasure friendship with them and will develop and strengthen it.

Comrades, the core of our foreign policy today is, of course, the struggle for terminating the arms race imposed by imperialism, for averting the threat of a world nuclear war.

We are at the threshold of new negotiations with the United States. Both sides have stated that they are entering them to prevent an arms race in space and terminate it on earth. They have come to terms to consider and resolve questions of space and nuclear arms as a set, in their interrelationship, which is absolutely indispensable to the success of the undertaking. This is the essence of the Geneva Accord. I would like to state once again with all clarity what our intentions in connection with the forthcoming talks are:

First: We do not strive to acquire any unilateral advantages over the United States and NATO countries, or for military superiority over them. We do not need it, as we have no intention of either threatening them or imposing our will on them, but want to live in peace and maintain normal, good relations with them.

Second: We want termination, and not continuation, of the arms race. This is precisely why the Soviet Union raises the question of such opening steps as a freeze on nuclear arsenals of the sides, an end to further deployment of missiles, etc. We consider the use of the negotiations for opposite purposes--for justifying and camouflaging further buildup and deployment of mass annihilation systems--to be an immoral and dishonorable business, a deception of peoples and a crime against them.

And third: We want a real reduction of the arms stockpiles, destruction of a substantial portion of them by way of a beginning, and not the development of increasingly new weapon systems, be it in space or on earth, and offensive or purportedly defensive systems. Our ultimate objective here is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere on this planet, the complete removal of the threat of nuclear war.

The divergence of views of the sides on the matters that will be discussed is great now. This is obvious to all. There is no shortage of gloomy forecasts which doom the negotiations to failure in advance. However, we do not share them.

Agreement is absolutely necessary and entirely possible. It is necessary for otherwise the world will keep sliding down the inclined plane of the arms race faster and faster and the threat of war will grow. Agreement is entirely possible because what this requires is simply to respect the rights and legitimate security interests of both sides, and not to strive to upset the existing balance of forces.

We call upon the leaders of the United States to approach the forthcoming negotiations seriously in good faith. We call upon them to get rid of the senseless hopes for military superiority over the Soviet Union, for conducting negotiations with us from "positions of strength." We call upon the leaders of the United States to approach the forthcoming negotiations seriously and in good faith. We call upon them to get rid of the senseless hopes for military superiority over the Soviet Union, for conducting negotiations with us from "positions of strength." We call upon them to renounce attempts at imposing such an agreement on us that will unilaterally bind the hands of the Soviet Union in strengthening its defenses, while throwing the doors wide open for implementation of record-high military programs drafted by Washington.

Such attempts bear absolutely no promise, yet they can undermine the possibility of agreement, which the peoples of our countries and all peoples are looking forward to, wishing lasting peace and a tranquil, happy life.

Comrades, the 40th year since victory prompts all of us to look once again both at our wartime experiences, at what was after the war and the prospects which are opening to the world today.

The countries of the coalition which defeated fascism belonged to different social systems. Yet they became allies. Their leaders succeeded in jointly outlining the fundamentals of the postwar arrangement. These fundamentals are recorded in the documents of Tehran, Yalta and Potsdam. Their main essence remains topical today as well: To translate into practice mankind's greatest desire--lasting peace. A way towards that was also charted--to preserve the unity of aims and actions, which made it possible to defeat Nazism and deliver the peoples from enslavement by the Hitlerites.

Some people might say that this could have happened only because there was war, and that Hitlerism was seen as a universal danger.

This is true. But today as well mankind, all peoples, have a common deadly enemy--the threat of a world nuclear catastrophe.

Take the events of the past decade. Eastern and Western state leaders were able, despite the serious differences dividing them, to display the necessary determination and understanding of the demands of the times. They made major strides towards lasting peace. A solid fabric of mutually beneficial cooperation began emerging and long-term principles of peaceful mutual relations were formulated jointly.

We find these principles in the document, which put on record the fundamentals of relations between the USSR and the United States, and in the agreement between them on preventing nuclear war. They were also mirrored in the treaties of the socialist countries with the FRG, which sealed the postwar realities in Europe. Finally, they won collective approval and were further developed in the Final Act of the European Conference in Helsinki.

Now history poses even more urgently the question of mankind's future. Courage and foresight in statesmen have become even more indispensable.

I have already had occasion to speak of the enormous significance that a binding agreement between the nuclear powers could have, an agreement to observe certain norms in their mutual relations so as to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war. Our proposal on this score remains in effect.

We also believe that in celebrating the 40th anniversary since the end of the most terrible and destructive of wars, the leaders of the USSR and the United States could jointly reaffirm, in a form suitable to both countries, the essence and spirit of the main commitments undertaken by both countries at the end of the war and in the agreements of the 1970s. They could declare their intention to act further in their foreign policy in the spirit of these

commitments. This would certainly help toward strengthening mutual trust and toward a general improvement of the world situation. I am confident that such a joint act would win the support of all peaceable states and all peoples.

Comrades, elections to the soviets of people's deputies are always a signal event in our country's life. This is indeed a triumphant event--the triumph of socialist democracy, the democracy which, genuinely, in practice, ensures the broad, interested participating of millions of working people in the administration of the state.

The election campaign has vividly demonstrated the growing consciousness and labor and public activeness of the masses. This, as Lenin more than once stressed, is the inexhaustible source of our system's strength.

The day after tomorrow Soviet citizens will come to the polling stations in all 15 Soviet Union republics. By voting for the candidates of the indissoluble bloc of communists and nonparty members, they will express their will to peace, and the readiness to strengthen in every way the fraternal friendship of the peoples of the USSR, to struggle with fresh vigor for further beneficial changes in every corner of our great homeland.

Allow me once again to thank you with all my heart for your trust. To us communists no striving is loftier and no happiness is greater than selflessly to serve the homeland, our people.

I wish you, dear comrades, good health, well-being and great successes in work, in all of your activities!

(The speech was heard with close attention and repeatedly interrupted by sustained applause.)

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985.

CSO: 1802/10

TO THE LEADERS OF THE ARGENTINE MOVEMENT 'APPEAL OF 100 IN THE NAME OF LIFE'

LD130954 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 85 (signed to press 27 Feb 85)
pp 10-11

[Message by K. Chernenko]

[Text] Gentlemen:

Thank you for the address you have sent me. It reflects the concern of the people of Argentina and other Latin American countries, which we understand full well, over the increased threat of a nuclear war. You write that the consciousness and conscience of the Argentine people impel you to stand up for the prime human right--the right to life. This aspiration is deeply consonant with the feelings of the Soviet people. It permeates all activities by our state in the international arena.

You probably know that the Soviet Union has already pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and this constructive stand has won the approval of the vast majority of the UN member states, including at the latest session of the UN General Assembly. We have suggested that the United States and other nuclear powers make similar pledges. But that insistent call of ours has been left without response to this day. You probably know that NATO's military strategy provides for the possibility of dealing a first nuclear strike. It is not difficult to imagine the catastrophic consequences the use of nuclear weapons may lead to.

In the Soviet Union we are deeply convinced that the historical dispute between the different social systems, just, as a matter of fact, as any other disputes and conflicts between states, can and must be settled only peacefully, especially in the present-day world which is oversaturated with weapons of mass annihilation. This is our principled stand. A nuclear war would have catastrophic consequences for humanity. It is time for the ruling circles of the West also to realize this simple truth of the nuclear age.

The Soviet Union is consistently opposed to any attempts to upset the existing military equilibrium. We stand for a radical reduction of the arsenals of nuclear and conventional weapons on the basis of equality and equal security, for general and complete disarmament and for the elimination of nuclear arms.

We have proposed that, given the attainment of a corresponding universal agreement, part of the funds that would be released as a result of cuts in military spending be spent on aid to developing countries. But here, too, matters are at a standstill due to the position taken by Western powers.

The Soviet leadership is doing everything possible to normalize the international situation and remove the war threat. We positively appraise the results of the recent Soviet-American meeting in Geneva, where it has been agreed to hold talks between the USSR and the United States on outer space, strategic nuclear arms and intermediate-range nuclear weapons. It is of essential importance that the questions of nuclear and space weapons be resolved at the talks in close interrelationship. We insist on this resolutely because the militarization of outer space, the "star wars" plans would give an impetus to a practically uncontrolled arms race in all directions and derail a number of important currently effective agreements on limiting the arms race. Mankind's vital interests demand that outer space be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that these disquieting days make more and more obvious the truth, corroborated by history, that the destinies of the world depend in a huge measure on the will and cohesive actions of the peoples. Today they are both able and called upon to say a firm "no" to nuclear death and stop the insane arms race. I wish your movement success in the noble and pressing cause of struggle to safeguard civilization and life itself on earth.

Respectfully, K. Chernenko

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

CSO: 1802/10

FOR A NUCLEAR-FREE NORTHERN EUROPE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 85 (signed to press 27 Feb 85) pp 11-12

[K. U. Chernenko's reply to an address from the "Treaty Now" Northern European Organization]

[Text] K. U. Chernenko pointed out that the movement for peace and against the nuclear arms race has become an important moral and political force in Europe, including the northern part of the continent. The Soviet people, he said, share the concern of the European public in connection with the dangerous worsening of the international climate, the continuing arms race and the nuclear threat hanging over humankind. Europe is being converted into a bridgehead for unleashing a nuclear conflict and deploying first-strike weapons. That is why the appeal of the participants in the movement for a nuclear-free Northern Europe for concluding a treaty on a nuclear-free zone, which would cover this area, as soon as possible, is quite topical.

In presenting the Soviet position on this problem, K. U. Chernenko emphasized in his answer that our country could have a positive influence on the creation of such a zone in Northern Europe. He recalled that the Soviet Union has repeatedly stated that it will never use nuclear weapons against countries which refuse to produce and acquire nuclear weapons and have no such weapons on their territory. Specifically, the USSR is prepared to assume the obligation not to use nuclear weapons against Northern European countries which would become part of a nuclear-free zone, i.e., which would abandon the production, acquisition and deployment of nuclear weapons on their territory. Such a guarantee could be the result either of multilateral agreements with the participation of the USSR or bilateral agreements with each country in the zone.

K. U. Chernenko confirmed the readiness of the Soviet Union to guarantee the nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe and to consider the question of some essential measures relative to its own territory adjacent to the zone, which would contribute to strengthening its nuclear-free status. In particular, the USSR would be ready to discuss with the interested parties the question of granting nuclear-free status to the Baltic Sea. The Soviet side does not base such steps on the positive attitude which the Western powers may take to a nuclear-free zone, although, naturally, the importance of the establishment

of such a zone for all its participants would be greater if similar obligations would be assumed by NATO nuclear powers.

The Soviet Union is a firm opponent of the senseless competition in the production and stockpiling of increasingly destructive armaments. It favors taking the most radical steps aimed at preventing the arms race in space and its termination on earth, restricting and reducing nuclear armaments until they have been totally eliminated, and strengthening strategic stability. The comprehensive solution of these closely interrelated problems will be discussed at the Soviet-American talks scheduled to begin in Geneva in March. However, some problems affecting nuclear armaments will not be included in the forthcoming talks and could be resolved separately. They include the creation of nuclear-free zones. The creation of such a zone in the European North would open new opportunities for strengthening trust and reducing tension in Europe and in the rest of the world.

In conclusion, K. U. Chernenko wished the authors of the letter and all participants in the peace movement in the Northern European countries further successes in their noble activities. He emphasized that the population of Northern Europe is fully able to succeed in making the European North a nuclear-free zone, thus making an important contribution to the cause of peace and security on our continent.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/10

FOR THE SAKE OF MAINTAINING PEACE ON EARTH

PM251149 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Feb 85 (signed to press 27 Feb 85)
pp 13-14

[K. U. Chernenko's address to Italian readers. From his book "Izbrannyye Stat'i i Rechi" [Selected Speeches and Articles], a mass edition of which was put out by the Italian Mondadori Publishers]

[Text] I willingly respond to the request from the Mondadori Publishing House to write a message to Italian readers for the collection of some of my articles and speeches. Geographically, our states are situated rather far apart, but our people share much in common. Over the centuries, from time immemorial, they have maintained and continue to develop various and extensive ties. It is not easy to find areas of human endeavor devoid of mutually enriching contacts between them. The Soviet people and the Italians, despite the fact that throughout the long history of relations between them there have certainly been other than cloudless periods, continue to have feelings of sincere sympathy and mutual respect for each other. This is the main thing. It is in this, along with objective political and economic factors, that we see a good basis for development and improvement of relations between the USSR and the Italian Republic, which is especially essential now, in the nuclear age, when the question of collaboration among states in order to preserve peace in the world and in order to save our civilization on earth arises.

Large masses of people, both ordinary citizens and many state leaders, are gripped by alarm for the future of the world. This is particularly noticeable in Europe, our common home. It is no accident that antiwar actions in many European countries have assumed a mass nature. The statements made this year and last by a number of West European statesmen in favor of peace and talks on weapons limitation and reduction complete the overall picture. Soviet people are particularly greatly impressed, too, by the persistence with which Italian Republic President A. Pertini issues appeals for peace, disarmament and cooperation. We are grateful to him, a convinced antifascist, for his reminder that Soviet Union paid "the highest price that has ever had to be paid by a people in war--20 million dead."

In the spring of 1985 the peoples of the world will mark the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II, the most brutal and bloody war in the history of mankind. We are proud that Soviet people also took the most direct part in

the battles against the Nazi fascist scum on Italian territory. We are grateful to the Italians for honoring the memory of our compatriots, who made their contribution, frequently at the cost of their own lives, to the cause of liberating Italy, to the cause of the common victory.

Thanks to that victory, 40 years ago the path was opened up to what was subsequently to be called the all-European process, the most important landmark in which was the 1975 Helsinki Conference. That conference left a deep imprint in the life of our continent. No matter how hard the proponents of the cold war assert that detente is "dead," we can see that over the 10 years that have passed since the Helsinki Final Act was signed, the European peoples have not only not forgotten Helsinki, but in fact are continually applying fresh efforts to continue the movement along the route that was marked out there.

I have already had the occasion to say--and will repeat it again--that the supreme interest of the Soviet people, of Soviet statesmen and party leaders, lies in achieving the curtailment of the arms race, naturally primarily that involving nuclear arms. We are willing to walk on our end of the road, going as far as the complete elimination of weapons of mass destruction, if the other side will also take up a constructive position and accept the principle of equality and identical security.

Guided by the Leninist foreign policy principles, we oppose the accumulation of explosive material, wherever it takes place. We are in favor of completely freeing Europe from nuclear weapons, wherever they may be deployed: on the ground, at sea, in the air, or even in space. Instead of building up a potential for mutual destruction, concern must be shown to ensure proper living conditions on earth for the present and future generations. For as technical progress develops, more and more global problems pile up for people on earth, particularly ecological. Work ought to be done jointly for their solution.

The Soviet people are engaged in peaceful labor. Vast building work and the comprehensive development of new areas, particularly in Siberia, are taking place throughout the country. In this connection, one recalls the times when Italians, thanks to their inventiveness and enterprise, opened new roads in international cooperation and set an example to others. Initiative of this kind was highly valued in the past and would also be useful today. For our part, we are willing to study the possibility of wider Italian participation in the implementation of our wide-ranging plans. Moreover, this does not just concern trade, economic and scientific and technical cooperation. In a word, we are in favor of most comprehensive and mutually advantageous relations with Italy.

In conclusion, I would like to express the hope that familiarity with the collection of my articles and speeches on the part of Italian readers will contribute to a better understanding of the present-day life of the Soviet people, their expectations and aspirations.

With all my heart I wish the Italian people prosperity in conditions of lasting peace.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsKI KPSS "Pravda" "KOMMUNIST", 1985

CSO: 1802/10

A PARTY THAT FIRMLY KNOWS ITS ROAD: ON THE OCCASION OF PUBLICATION OF K. U. CHERNENKO'S BOOK 'ON THE ROAD OF PERFECTING DEVELOPED SOCIALISM'

AU200601 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 85 (signed to press 27 Feb 85)
pp 15-26

[Editorial]

[Text] The party and all Soviet people are preparing for the 27th CPSU Congress. Every congress of the communist party represents a landmark in the country's life. The period of preparations for it is a time of profound interpretation of what has been achieved, appraisal of what has been accomplished, intent examination of past experience, and, at the same time, self-critical uncovering of shortcomings and omissions, determination of the ways of correcting these shortcomings and omissions and setting new tasks, both immediate and long-term ones.

A period of great decisions particularly sharply demands of communists--regardless in what sector they may work--that they show boldness and breadth in their generalizations, and that they understand the scale of problems and the complex realities of the contemporary world. And this, in its turn, demands an activeness of thought because the very tasks that history has set before us are of an innovative nature in all spheres of activity, be it in the intensification of the national economy and acceleration of scientific technical progress, the fulfillment of the Food and Energy programs, or a further development of socialist democracy and advancement of the ideological-educational work.

Our life is rich in the events that make the hearts of the Soviet people swell with pride, but this life also poses questions that must be answered precisely and operationally. Our everyday work has never before been filled with such great accomplishments, whether in scale or complexity. Comparing them with some not so very distant accomplishments of 20 or 30 years ago, it is easy to see how the tasks and concerns have been condensed and compressed in time, in every year, every month and every day.

This is the feeling that one experiences in reading the book by K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, entitled "On the Road of Perfecting Developed Socialism," published recently by the Political Literature Publishing House. The book contains the author's speeches and statements in the period since

February 1984.

It is a relatively short period but how very many events of immense importance for the fate of both the Soviet country and for the whole of mankind took place during it. The book conveys to the reader the growing pace of our intense period and shows the scale of the tasks solved by the communist party, its Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee Politburo both in the sphere of domestic policy and in the international arena. The reader obtains a complete picture of what animates our party on the eve of its 27th Congress.

The following passages from Comrade K. U. Chernenko's speech at the All-Union Conference of People's Controllers on 5 October 1984 appears on the book's dust jacket:

"We have come close to the frontiers which, in a certain sense, will represent a turning point. What is involved in this connection are the qualitative changes that have been prepared by the entire course of our development and the enormous creative work of the party and people developed on the basis of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent Central Committee plenums.

"These changes are ripe and they have become necessary in the development of production forces and in their transformation on the basis of scientific-technical progress. The system of management of the economy and its planning also cannot do without these changes. Our economic mechanism must be essentially improved. The welfare of the people must be raised to a qualitatively new level. And, of course, all this is unthinkable without the conscientious and concerned work and initiative of Soviet people, of each and every one of them. And this means that here, too, changes are needed: It is necessary to ensure that the work and social activeness of the masses will not simply continue to grow as until now but will multiply in the literary sense of the word."

K. U. Chernenko has called this entire complex of problems, so laconically formulated here, the living fiber of the process of perfecting the socialism created in our country, the process that is the essence of the period in which we live and which will undoubtedly be at the center of attention of the 27th CPSU Congress.

As a rule, essentially new problems are not subject to old methods. The following idea runs through K. U. Chernenko's book: Everyone must fully understand the newness and great complexity of the tasks facing our society, and the fact that the tasks of this kind can only be solved in a creative manner. Creativity and innovativeness, imbued with the spirit of political and scientific realism, are the most necessary qualities of the builder of the new world, the most indispensable features of the character of the communist of our period.

The 27th CPSU Congress will adopt the new edition of the CPSU program, which is expected to clearly outline the long-term prospects and the final goals to which we aspire, trace the road to the future and open up new social horizons, placing the main emphasis on the historically foreseeable future and the goals that can be attained by present generations. Under contemporary conditions our program must be a program of perfecting developed socialism.

Speaking at the session of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for the preparation of New Edition of the Party Program, K. U. Chernenko said that the theme of the party must be a through-and-through central theme of that historic document. The program should reveal the party's strategy and tactics, the principles of its activity and its place and role in the Soviet society's political system. The choice of this theme as the central one is determined by the party's growing leading role in all spheres of the country's social life. The new social system can be built and can function successfully only with the assistance of the communist party's directing activity. And the leading role of the party increases with every new historical stage. This is an objective natural law.

When socialism, entering the period of its maturity, acquires the characteristics of an integral system, the economic, sociopolitical and spiritual factors become more closely interrelated and mutually interdependent than ever before. Therefore, the party work itself assumes a qualitatively new character and the period of preparations for the regular congress becomes a time of a comprehensive and exacting review of party tasks.

At the 27th Congress the party will have to consider the question of amendments to the CPSU Statute. These amendments will contribute to further consolidating the party's democratic foundations, strengthening a strict and unified discipline for all communists, increasing their activity and initiative and perfecting internal party relations.

K. U. Chernenko emphasizes: The two fundamental party documents must represent an organic unity. Both the program and the statute should reflect the high demands--emanating from the CPSU political course--as regards the organization of the party's internal life, the style and methods of activity of each of its links, and the work and behavior of communists and their activeness, responsibility and discipline (p 293).

The country is now at the beginning of a great turn toward solving the tasks of perfecting the socialism built in our country. The tasks are completely within our power. The revolutionary and creative potential of the land of the Soviets is enormous and the main thing in this potential is, to use V. I. Lenin's words, the "benefit of the premises of the party that firmly knows its road..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 34, p 244).

In his report at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum K. U. Chernenko said that unremitting attention should be devoted to instilling in communists the need for theory and the interest in and taste for it. In recent years the party has advanced an entire complex of ideas that have enriched the Marxist-Leninist teaching. They are firmly connected with the life, practice and deep trends of development of the socialist society. In his new book K. U. Chernenko once again emphasizes the acute necessity of ensuring that every individual communist and every individual Soviet citizen will be equipped with a high degree of theoretical knowledge. It is impossible for anyone without this knowledge to become a conscious political fighter who is capable of independently appraising social phenomena and perceiving the link between contemporary tasks and our ultimate goals.

The concept of developed socialism represents the main strategy and tactics of the party at the contemporary stage. The fundamental theoretical conclusions drawn by K. U. Chernenko concerning the level of social maturity achieved by Soviet society and the fact that, before the tasks directly connected with the construction of communism can be solved, it is necessary to pass through a historically long stage of developed socialism, at which our country now finds itself (p 375), are of decisive importance for CPSU activity.

Just as a ship's crew must know precisely its geographic coordinates in order to be able to chart the right course in the vast spaces of the ocean, so a society needs orientation in the limitless ocean that is called the history of mankind in order to be able to chart its adjusted course toward the future. A determination of the level of maturity achieved by the Soviet society gives us a strictly scientific picture of our immediate and long-term tasks and helps us plan the ways of achieving them. Briefly, a precise definition of one's position within the framework of the communist formation becomes the basis for charting the general course along the clearly marked main guidelines, that is, economic, social, political and ideological-moral guidelines.

A strictly scientific analysis of the contemporary stage of development of Soviet society is a guarantee against the mistakes of a voluntarist nature and provides a direction toward a sober appraisal of the specific characteristics of the current historical period and situation without detracting from the achieved successes, without excessively embellishing the actual reality and without dramatizing shortcomings. Precisely a scientific and realistic approach to the appraisal of the state of our society and a resolute overcoming of obsolete stereotypes make it possible to boldly and resolutely enter such a greatly complicated and such currently important sphere as that of the problem of contradictions under socialism.

K. U. Chernenko investigates this cardinal methodological problem most completely and comprehensively in the article "Up to the Level of the Demands of Developed Socialism. Some Current Problems of the CPSU Theory, Strategy and Tactics." This is the article that concludes this new book.

The analysis of contradictions is the foundation of scientific investigation of the multifaceted processes that characterize the development of the new socioeconomic formation. A society that is free from private ownership of the means of production and from the exploitation of man by man is not free from contradictions. Even as they may be nonantagonistic, they are contradictions that are natural and necessarily exist in any development.

A society at the beginning of the stage of developed socialism appears as a contradictory combination of both the great and truly historic successes in socialist construction and the general communist principles that have asserted themselves in our life, as well as of the unfulfilled tasks of the present time and the problems we have inherited from the past.

No sphere of our life is free from contradictions. In the economy this contradiction is the combination of the enterprises that are equipped with advanced equipment and machines and are working according to the latest technology, on the one hand, and the plants and factories that operate with obsolete technical equipment and according to the technology of yesterday, on the other. This combination engenders a certain contradiction between the material-technical and organizational aspects of production and its socialist socioeconomic character that is conditioned by social ownership.

We have to deal also in other spheres of our life with the contradictions engendered by differences in the level of socialist maturity and in the degree of implementation of the principles and norms of socialism. High standards of conscientious attitude toward work and socialist property still exist side by side with laxity, mismanagement and an aspiration of some people to live at the expense of society. The problems that exist in the social sphere and are connected with specific differences between the interests of various classes and social groups and with the need for a maximum coordination of these interests are also not simple. In the political sphere, there is a certain discrepancy between the richest potentials of socialist democracy and their real utilization. In the sphere of national relations it is the vestiges of the past in the people's psychology and the manifestations of parochialism and national narrowmindedness that are still apparent.

Analyzing the current problems of our social development, the author turns to the invaluable Leninist legacy. And in particular to one of the last works of Vladimir I'lich in which the conclusion is made that, "despite the general laws of development throughout the entire world history, some individual periods of development that represent a peculiarity either of forms or of order of that development," "or modification of the usual historical order..." "not only are not excluded but, on the contrary, are assumed to occur" (op. cit, vol 45, pp 379, 381).

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution made our country the most progressive country in the political respect at a time when the level of development of production forces and the standards necessary for building socialism had not yet been achieved in every respect. The changes in the historical order rested in the fact that the workers and peasants first won power in order to subsequently overcome the material-technical backwardness on the basis of that power. And it must be admitted that some of our contemporary problems and difficulties are historically connected precisely with the fact that not all the tasks engendered by these modifications of the "usual order" have been definitely and finally resolved (pp 378-379).

K. U. Chernenko points out in his new book that, in addition to its scientific content, the concept of developed socialism also possesses an enormous moral-political potential. A realistic characterization of our achievements and advantages is important both from the viewpoint of political-educational work within the country and from the viewpoint of the struggle we are waging on the international scene. No less important is a well-thought-out scientific assessment of the future, an assessment that at times evokes in people questions whose answers directly influence the formation of the active position in the lives of millions and millions of people.

In a generalized form these questions may be as follows: By speaking about the historically long period of the stage of developed socialism, are we not putting off the communist future, are we not "damping the ardor" of people, and are we not undermining the enthusiasm of the masses? These are some of those currently important questions that require a convincing and intelligible answer. If we fail to answer them, they will be answered by our ideological adversaries using the latest achievements of their "science" of "psychological warfare."

K. U. Chernenko gives a simple and unambiguous answer to these questions. "No, we are not putting off the communist future. But to bring it nearer it is possible only in one way, that is, by solving the entire complex of great and complicated problems that are related to some or other levels of the first stage of communist formation" (p 237). The author especially emphasizes that the duration of the stage of developed socialism in no way signifies that we can allow ourselves not to concern ourselves with constantly accelerating the pace or to put off any ripe tasks for a later period. Today we are directing all the people's creative forces and their work initiatives toward accelerating our progress to a maximum possible degree.

Hence follows yet another of K. U. Chernenko's important conclusions: Solving the entire complex of great and complicated problems related by their origin and nature to some or other levels of the first stage of communism represents the substance of that multilevel work which the party defines as perfecting the socialism built in our country (p 378).

Since perfecting socialism built in our country is equivalent to advancing toward communism, the paths of achieving the highest socioeconomic progress become even more precisely defined and concretized and the essence of this progress can be expressed succinctly and clearly: to move forward and to orient oneself to the higher and most exacting ideas about socialism that have been worked out by scientific theory (p 379).

In the pages of his new book K. U. Chernenko provides a graphic interpretation of this most important conclusion. Addressing the young people who have been fortunate to be born in the society that has achieved the highest social progress in the history of the world, the author points out that the merits of those who are now entering their working life before the fatherland and before history will be measured first and foremost by how successfully they cope with the tasks of perfecting socialism built in our country and by the extent to which they advance toward bringing that socialism into complete accord with the socialist ideal and toward eliminating from our life everything that contradicts the idea of social justice (pp 143-144).

This demand does not apply only to youth but also to all other generations of Soviet people. Alignment with the higher norms of socialism must become our rule and our habit. Precisely these norms should become the main criterion also in the evaluation of our everyday tasks and of our plans for the future.

Returning to the question of whether we are not putting off the communist future, the author of the book rightfully concludes: "Thus, what is involved is not a question of slowing down our advance to communism but a question of

its acceleration, a real and actual acceleration in which realistic goals are set and realistic means are used to achieve them" (p 382).

Economic questions have been allotted a major place in K. U. Chernenko's book: The contemporary level of the economy is analyzed and the actual tasks of economic policy and its main final goals are defined. A consistent improvement of the life of the Soviet people has always been and continues to be the party's general line and the main guideline in the economic sphere. And the successes achieved in this sphere have been and continue to be the main criterion of the correctness of the party's economic policy. Any major economic question in our country--at whatever level it may be posed--is directed in the final analysis to raising the standard of living of the people. And no complications in the international situation which force us to divert considerable resources for defense have ever resulted in the socialist society in any curtailment of social programs, something that is a characteristic feature of the capitalist formation.

The economic aspect of our social system would be defective without yet another essential characteristic trait: In working out global foreign policy strategy, the party has always proceeded from the fact that socialism exercises its main influence on the international development and the course of world history with its economic successes. Using Lenin's words in this connection, economic construction is our "main policy" (pp 382-383).

In the last 2 years, we have witnessed quite significant successes of the Soviet national economy. The economy has begun to develop more dynamically and positive changes have begun to show in the work of many branches.

During the year K. U. Chernenko addressed the questions of the party's economic policy on several occasions, that is, in his speeches at the February, April and October CPSU Central Committee plenums, at the session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on 15 November 1984, and in many other statements that are included in the book.

The definition of the essence of scientific approach to the economy is of a principled importance. This approach must be conditioned by the concept of developed socialism and must correspond to the demand for realism inherent in that concept. This means that it is necessary to have a clear picture of what the economy can or cannot deliver within the framework of the first stage of communist formation, and not to allow any underestimation of the socialist economy's potential.

However we may rejoice in our successes, now the questions demanding a sharp change of the state of affairs in the Soviet national economy have been objectively placed on the agenda by the course of historical development itself. And this is caused by the fact that our economy itself has advanced closely to the limit at which qualitative shifts and changes in it have become an imperative necessity. This is precisely how the book's author defines and firmly poses the question (p 383).

The problem of combining the scientific-technical revolution with the socialist organization of production is considered as an urgent task of our period, both concretely and materially. Highly productive technical equipment multiplied by a general economic interest in its utilization can make the ripe economic turning point a reality. In this connection it is also necessary to consider the main advantages provided by the economic nature of socialism. Today there is still little understanding of the fact that, in our country, the work of the individual in the final analysis raises the prosperity of all working people. This quality of the socialist organization of production must become firmly instilled in the awareness of the people to ensure that any socially useful work is directly and tangibly perceived by those who carry it out as work for themselves. It is absolutely essential to combine a realistic approach to the economy with the breadth and boldness of views and with a strictly scientific approach to solving economic problems. The realism of economic calculations must be illuminated by a broad political vision and must be based on the knowledge and skillful application of the laws of development of the socialist economy. In other words, economic practice must not be substantiated only economically but, first and foremost, also politically and economically.

These demands do not conform to some old, but here and there still existing habitual economic yardsticks and to the old scale of priorities. The turning point is ripe not only in the economy but also in economic thinking itself. The existing traditional stereotypes under which, let us say, the quantitative, the gross-volume approach clearly prevailed over the qualitative approach are falling down.

How should the innovative tasks facing the Soviet economy be solved? With what methods? What is it to which special attention should be directed? The book "On the Road of Perfecting Developed Socialism" provides answers to these questions: intensification and increased effectiveness of production operations, intensification of the system of economizing labor and material resources in every way possible, raising the level of production, planning and contractual discipline and perfecting the system of economic management and control.

However, first and foremost, there is the intensification of production. It is precisely this intensification, based on a considerable acceleration of scientific-technical progress and the comprehensive perfecting and improvement of the forms and methods of socialist economic operations, that has become the main economic guideline in the party's general course toward perfecting the developed socialist society. This is conditioned by the frontiers which the national economy of the land of the soviets has now reached. K. U. Chernenko emphasizes that the Soviet economy's own successes have set the limits of its extensive development. The need for intensification is dictated not only and even not by a shortage of resources but instead, first and foremost, by the fact that our national economy has already ensured such production volume in view of which--in order to move forward--it is necessary not only to expand but also to renovate (p 385).

Thus, what is involved is not a matter of some kind of a "crisis of the Soviet economy," which Western "specialists" for Soviet problems have been repeating over and over again with enviable persistence not just for one year or, after all, not just for one decade, but the fact that much of what had previously been planned for the distant future is now within the power of our national economy. Our forces are now such as oblige us to set ourselves a major task of programmatic importance, that is, the task of ensuring the country's advance to the higher world level of social labor productivity.

This lofty goal was set by Lenin. It is essentially connected with the realization of the socialist ideal. Today this goal already corresponds to our economic possibilities and this means that what is the most important and the principal thing for a final and complete triumph of the new formation--which, according to Lenin, is the achievement of higher labor productivity--has become a very practical task. It must be firmly instilled in our consciousness and, as the author of the book graphically puts it, must be literally before our very eyes in our country already now (p 386).

Analyzing the contemporary state and prospects of the Soviet economy, K. U. Chernenko reveals yet another natural law of development of our society at the higher level: the formulation and solution of such great and difficult national economic problems have necessarily resulted in an increased volume and enriched content of the CPSU's economic work. A special concern of the party now is to ensure for the people the necessary conditions for revealing and contributing their abilities. And this concern is not dictated only by an acute economic necessity but also by the requirements of social justice. Herein lies one of the most strenuous and most responsible sectors of party work. To occupy itself with the economy means for the CPSU, first and foremost, to occupy itself with the people who lead the economy. "Tasks are economic, methods are political--this essentially is the formula of party leadership in the economy" (p 392). This is the conclusion made by the book's author.

K. U. Chernenko's new book reveals the many-sided activities of the party's Central Committee and its Politburo to activate the reserves of the people's initiative which exist in the further perfecting of socialist democracy and of the entire political system of our society.

The Soviet people are rightfully proud of the great social achievements of the country of the soviets. Genuine personal freedoms and guaranteed human rights that are not possible under any other social system have not only become the law of the state but have become a habit for everyone. However, the potential of socialist democracy has not been exhausted by far; the progressive movement of our society is expanding the horizons of the further democratization of the Soviet political system and authoritatively demands: Everyone not only has the right but is also obliged to act as the master of the country. The purpose of perfecting our political system is to develop to the maximum extent the creative force of the people's socialist self-government and to ensure a direct participation of everyone in the administration of the state's and society's affairs.

"A complete implementation of the people's socialist self-government is our main guideline in the development of the political system," K. U. Chernenko writes. "We understand this self-government as a system of administration of the affairs of the society and the state which, in Lenin's words, not only functions for the working people, but also through the working people themselves" (p 380).

The book's author devotes special attention to the process of increasing the party's leading role in all spheres of social life. The growth of the party's leading role and the deepening of socialist democracy represent a unified, integral and natural process; the party plays the leading role in the democratization of the entire political system of the Soviet society. An exemplary organization of its own work and a greater exactingness represent the main method of the party's influence in this sphere. The party is strengthening its leading role by consistently adhering to the Leninist norms and principles and to the Leninist style in the activity of party committees, state and economic organs and social organizations. A competent implementation of the tested principle of democratic centralism is of primary importance.

In 1984 K. U. Chernenko more than once addressed the questions of the work of the soviets. This work has been considerably intensified in recent years. This has been the result of a broadening of the rights of the organs of people's representatives, and the Leninist principle of unity of legislation, administration and control has begun to be more completely implemented in their activity. The role of local soviets in coordinating the activities of enterprises of various branches located in their territory has increased.

However, the book's author points out, the immense potential of the soviets is insufficiently utilized (p 56). There are many reserves here and to activate them it is necessary to persistently strive to ensure that the constitutional rights of the soviets will be used to their full extent and that the aktiv of the soviets, numbering tens of millions of people, will be truly active. And in this connection it is necessary to even further increase the party's influence in the soviets. A rich experience has already been accumulated in this connection and the methods of the party's influence have been verified by the practice of many years. What is also important in this connection is the example of deputies-communists through whom the party exercises its leading role in the soviets and who are called upon to introduce the organizing principle into all levels of people's representative organs. But the main thing is the fact that the party asserts its political influence through its tireless struggle for the good and happiness of the working people and by working out and implementing the scientific policy that is in accord with every given stage of the society's development.

K. U. Chernenko noted in his election speech on 22 February 1985: "The elections for the organs of Soviet power are a direct and obvious expression of the people's political will. And we communists naturally take pride in the fact that the Soviet people are nominating among their candidates, first and foremost, representatives of the Leninist party, the leading force of our society. This is convincing testimony of the working people's support for the CPSU policy, a testimony of the indestructible unity of the party and the people."

K. U. Chernenko examines, within the framework of activities of the soviets, the problem of perfecting intranational relations. The remarkable achievements in the establishment of national relations of the new, socialist type, too, as well as the specific characteristics of these relations under the conditions of developed socialism, are noticeable precisely in the sphere of the socialist sovereignty of the people. And it is not only the specific characteristics but also the dynamics of these relations that are noticeable: National relations in our country are subject to constant changes under the impact of new circumstances and time. Embodying the indissoluble unity of the international and the national, the soviets are called upon to continue to perfect the already discovered forms of organization and methods of work aimed at further promoting the flourishing of and rapprochement between nations.

The analysis of the functioning and of development prospects of the Soviet political system incorporated in this book is especially valuable and significant because it is made by the author by penetrating deep into the essence of the existing realities of socialist democracy and because it is organically combined with a bold and critical contrasting of the present situation to the higher demands of the scientific theory of socialism. This does not apply only to the soviets, but also to the activities of trade unions, the Komsomol and labor collectives and to all links in our democratic system.

The Soviet democracy is a dynamic democracy and it cannot be anything but that in our society. By constantly orienting itself toward the future, the party represents, as K. U. Chernenko has said, the motor and the motive force of progress and provides with its internal life an example of genuine socialist democracy (p 32).

The enormous number of tasks, transformations and qualitative changes in all spheres of our life--all this represents the concrete and businesslike content of the stage which the Soviet society has entered. But as is known, the task is organized by men, that means any task, including also the task that is under discussion here. What kind of people must organize this unprecedented task, the task of perfecting socialism that has been built in our country? The author is greatly animated by this question and readers will find in the pages of his book also profoundly and well-thought-out conclusions, clear party appraisals and aims and reflections by a man who has grown wise with the experience of life.

It is clear: An uplift of the society is unthinkable without an ideological-moral and spiritual uplift of the individual. If the society comes face-to-face with qualitatively new problems, then there also arises the need for a qualitatively new level of social awareness of those whose fate it is to toil in the thick of these problems. What is needed is a resolute reorientation of social awareness as well as ability and, having overcome obsolete traditions, it is necessary to quickly absorb new ideas and uncompromisingly reject obsolete views.

Creative tasks are not solved by routine-like methods. And this means that what is on the agenda of the society that has entered the period of developed socialism is the need for a sharp uplift of the creative potential of the individual. The social need for the knowledge and initiative of the broadest

popular masses is greater today than ever before. Talent, capability and skill are the greatest state property.

Society, economy, individual--the interdependence between these concepts is multifaceted and is becoming increasingly close and indissoluble. This is what K. U. Chernenko says in this connection in his new book: "It is impossible to raise the economy to a qualitatively new level without creating the necessary social and ideological prerequisites for this. It is equally impossible to solve the ripe problems of development of socialist awareness without relying on the solid foundation of economic and social policies" (pp 12-13).

Yes, everything here is interconnected as in a formula expressing the indissolubility of the economic and social progress: to live better it is necessary to work better. The author of the book reveals the richness of the substance of this seemingly simple truth by showing the interweaving of the material, spiritual, moral and psychological values in the main sphere of human life, in work.

Work in the highest and broadest sense of the word is the subject of close attention of the author. He considers work as the basis of social recognition of the individual and of his social prestige. Touching on the problem of education, he stresses the necessity of creating an atmosphere of a respectful attitude toward all work for common benefit and of contempt for idleness, idle talk and irresponsibility. He analyzes the forms and methods of educational work at various levels, within the framework of the labor collective and at the level of the entire society. The author is not parsimonious in giving examples and making pointed observations. Here is one of them. If the society knows how to convincingly and clearly express its irreconcilability toward all kinds of scroungers and parasites, then in this way it actively elevates and socially stimulates conscientious work.

In 1984 a nationwide discussion was held on questions connected with the reform of general and vocational schools. The April CPSU Central Committee Plenum adopted a corresponding resolution. It is understandable that such an important event in the life of the country has found its expression on the pages of K.U. Chernenko's book. Examining the wide range of problems with schools from political, economic, social and moral positions, the author directs the reader to reflect upon the future of young citizens in the light of the main program tasks of perfecting developed socialism. He notes: "To ensure that Soviet society will confidently move forward every new generation must rise to increasingly higher levels of education and general culture, professional qualifications and civic activeness" (p 62).

The author emphasizes once again that the idea of perfecting developed socialism must be the basis not only of theoretical but also of all propaganda and educational work, and he especially singles out the necessity of consistently adhering to the Leninist principle of the unity of ideological and organizational work.

Two main traits have determined the appearance of our country since the day of its birth: The Soviet Union has been, is, and will continue to be a state of social equality and justice and a state that tirelessly follows the course of

peace and cooperation. These two traits are inseparable from each other and they have the same nature, the same social character and the same fate. Therefore it is completely understandable that the active and progressive foreign policy activity of the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo is revealed in K. U. Chernenko's new book in indissoluble unity with the party's domestic policy.

The author presents to the reader the wide panorama of the contemporary anxious world, our planet that is overloaded with explosive materials beyond all measure. Today there can be no more important problem concerning the interests of a majority of mankind than the problem of preservation of peace. The first and foremost foreign policy goal of the party is to avert the threat of nuclear war and end the arms race. And if concern for the future today haunts hundreds of millions of people on earth, then the sole responsibility for this is borne by imperialist reaction and the entrenched militarists for whom preparations for war are a super-profit business.

The country of the soviets contrasts the adventurist course of the Western reactionary forces with its firm course toward improving international situation, firmly basing its position on the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. All foreign policy initiatives of the Soviet state are aimed at reducing tension, ending the arms race, preventing the threat of nuclear war and preserving peace on earth.

We are against confrontation in the military sphere, K. U. Chernenko notes, we are resolutely in favor of a radical limitation and reduction of the arms race and of banning and complete liquidation of nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union has assumed the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and not to use them against the countries that have neither their own nor foreign nuclear weapons on their territories.

The book cites many examples to show the diverse and painstaking activity of the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo which is aimed at solving the most complicated international problems through negotiations, that is, through businesslike and honest negotiations and not negotiations that are used as an element of protraction or as a means of ill-meaning manipulation of public opinion in the countries of capital.

The Soviet Union does not seek military superiority but it cannot remain indifferent in face of a growing threat from the imperialist forces and is ready to defend itself and its allies against any aggressor. The growth of our defense capability represents a countermeasure that has been forced upon us and which is necessary and also understandable to every Soviet citizen. Our people have not forgotten, the book points out, how in June 1941 fascist Germany took advantage of a temporary advantage and perfidiously attacked our country. World War II cost the Soviet people 20 million human lives. That war has left a deep scar on the soul of the Soviet people, as well as a memory that is transmitted from generation to generation.

Today we are no longer what we were in 1941 and we are not what we were when we victoriously ended the war in 1945; we are stronger, we have more friends and like-minded followers, and our authority in the world is greater. The book also discusses this. The author substantiates the need to preserve and strengthen the friendship of the fraternal countries of socialism, expand their cooperation in all spheres and strengthen their alliance within the Warsaw Pact Organization.

In our extremely unsettled and anxious period when the propaganda militarists have developed their feverish activity hand-in-hand with the business militarists, the truth about the Soviet Union and its foreign policy also represents a weapon, the weapon of peace. The book gives a vivid account of the strategy and tactics of the Soviet peace offensive. The collected materials and documents on K. U. Chernenko's numerous meetings with statesmen and party leaders, his interviews with Soviet and foreign press correspondents and his replies to the letters from various organizations not only show the colossal volume of what has been accomplished in the field of foreign policy in 1 year but also provide an example of a scientific and realistic analysis of the most complicated situations in which, alas, our restless period abounds.

And on the other hand, the book provides a fund of optimism that is so badly needed by many people in the West, an optimism that is not feigned or ostentatious but profoundly substantiated.

Action engenders counteraction. The whipping up of war hysteria by the militarist circles is provoking a wave of popular protests on all continents of the earth. This unprecedented upsurge in social activeness is also a manifestation of the feeling of self-preservation that is natural for every human being and for every people, as well as of an awareness of the need for a resolute struggle for a peaceful future of human civilization, an awareness that is constantly growing under the influence of the world communist movement.

The outburst of antiwar feelings and the strengthening of antiwar convictions give hope and provide the basis for our optimism.

K. U. Chernenko's book "On the Road of Perfecting Developed Socialism" represents a very timely publication. It has been published on the eve of the 40th anniversary of the Great Victory, in the final year of the 11th Five-Year Plan, in the year of active preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress.

It is time to sum up the results and precisely define future prospects, to make thoughtful analyses and strictly scientific forecasts, a time to interpret the past experience and to plan the future and to appraise our achievements and possibilities in the light of the most exacting ideas about socialism, and a time to collate the work of every individual and the entire immense Soviet state with the main guidelines of the general party course of perfecting the developed socialist society.

Yes, it is a very timely book, a book that convincingly reveals the "benefit of the premises of a party that firmly knows its road..."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985.

CSO: 1802/10

A DECISIVE LINK IN PARTY LEADERSHIP

AU140501 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 85 (signed to press 27 Feb 85)
pp 27-39

[Article by G. Razumovskiy, first secretary of the Krasnodar CPSU Kraykom]

[Text] An episode that occurred several years ago often comes to mind.

...The plenary meeting of the party raykom had just ended. Communists from the rayon party organization had elected a new first secretary. The young, energetic man mounted the platform, thanked everyone, as is the custom, for their trust, and promised to work as hard as possible. Then an unusual appeal suddenly followed.

"You have entrusted me with leadership and therefore I ask you not to take offense at my strict request. We are all equal before the party, and I ask you to be just as strict and principled in your attitude toward me. If I err, get confused, or do not understand something, correct me directly and decisively. If I am right--support me, guilty--punish me, incompetent--replace me. Another thing: Any letter, any appeal, any signal, that points out my shortcomings as a secretary, as a communist, or as a person will be heard before the party aktiv and the justice of the complaint will be judged by us together and aloud.

A stir ran through the hall. Some approved of the secretary's speech, some were perplexed, and others saw this appeal even as a "pose," as a phrase uttered for effect. Nevertheless, what was heard had a profound effect and forced everyone present to take a close look at himself, pull himself together and take himself in hand.

The secretary's subsequent work convinced the aktiv, communists and all the inhabitants of the rayon that he was fulfilling his promise and that in his case there was no breach between word and deed. It is understandable that a man who did not fear to have his actions judged by the public ultimately won universal respect. His advice was followed, his tasks fulfilled, his demands met, his criticism heeded and his requests--both exacting and severe--were not the cause of offense. This was all because people sensed the main thing behind this: the truth of life and the rightness of the party line. People knew that if the secretary suddenly deviated in some way from this, it would

be possible to directly and openly correct him. Thus a climate of mutual respect, trust and principled exactingness developed in the rayon party organization, a climate in which the raykom secretary himself developed, growing into the authoritative party worker he is today.

This case is characteristic and memorable by the fact that it illuminates, in my opinion, precisely those features and qualities in a leader and in his ideological-moral make-up which do not always find reflection in characterizations, but which we persistently seek today by selecting and educating cadres in accordance with the requirements of life and the aims of the party, clearly formulated by Comrade K. U. Chernenko: "Party and state cadres win the sympathy and respect of the masses primarily in real social practice by their energy and knowledge and their personal example and conduct free of everything that offends the moral sensibilities of the individual."

Today the Central Committee does not simply pose the problem of improving work with the cadres, but of cadre policy at the contemporary stage. This means, as Comrade K. U. Chernenko writes in his article "To the Level of the Requirements of Developed Socialism," that changes corresponding to contemporary conditions are required throughout the entire system of selecting, training and advancing cadres and controlling their activities.

The article emphasizes that the degree of precision, coordination and intensity reached in the work of the labor collectives and all units of the country's national economy complex depends on the cadres, primarily on the party cadres. Cadre policy is an important factor in the comprehensive progress of Soviet society.

Selecting, educating and placing skilled, enterprising workers loyal to the party cause, and replacing those who do not meet the present requirements expected of leaders in any sector--this is now the chief aspect of cadre work performed by the kray party organization, difficult, responsible and urgent work excluding any compromises whatsoever and superficial, rash decisions.

We are reminded of the danger of a superficial, unexact approach to analyzing the three components of the individual--practical, political and moral qualities--by the bitter experience of the recent past, when serious errors were permitted in the kray in the selection and education of leading cadres. The cost of these errors was high. Production indexes deteriorated, primarily in the agrarian sector of the kray's economy, and the growth rates in agricultural production slowed. The problems of politically and morally educating the workers were exacerbated. During the last 1.5 to 2 years alone, many leading workers in the kray have been freed from their posts and punished according to party procedure, even dismissed from the party, and some have even faced criminal charges. In a number of cities and rayons, where the greatest number of abuses and other negative phenomena were brought to light, the staff of leading organs has been virtually completely replaced. This a hard lesson and, having drawn the necessary conclusions from it, we not only strive to rectify the errors permitted, but also to adopt measures that will make it possible to prevent them from being repeated in the future.

In his article "To the Level of the Requirements of Developed Socialism," Comrade K. U. Chernenko notes that "in a number of cases local party organs and the leaders of departments and institutions do not possess sufficient information on negative phenomena, or else they simply brush it aside and fail to adopt the necessary measures to improve the situation. Such has been the case in Uzbekistan, Rostov Oblast, and Krasnodar Kray. As is well known, the situation here has had to be decisively rectified, and, unfortunately, not at the initiative of the local party organizations. The barometer on public opinion there has long swung away from 'fine.'"

Insufficient information on the true state of affairs in the field, on the real qualities of this or that worker, and on the earliest, as they say, signs of negative phenomena coming into being deprived the kray party committees of their main weapon in the struggle against these phenomena--warning and preventive measures. And so phenomena of this kind accumulated, gathered strength and took hold of more and more new sectors and workers. Naturally, not being subjected to sober analysis and not being given principled appraisal, these negative phenomena were not stopped in time.

The decisive measures adopted by the CPSU Central Committee were everywhere unanimously supported by the working people. These measures have helped to strengthen discipline, legality and law and order. An atmosphere of responsibility, exactingness and efficiency is now being established in the life of the kray party organization and of the entire kray. Under the leadership and with the constant aid of the CPSU Central Committee, the party kraykom is now continuing the work to improve the situation in the kray. We are conducting this work without haste, consistently and persistently. Its results are already making themselves felt both in certain positive changes in the socioeconomic development of the kray and in the change in the qualitative element of the cadres.

From a statistical point of view, the changes taking place look like this: During 1983-1984 almost half of the party gorkom and raykom secretaries and chairmen of the gorispolkoms and rayispolkoms were replaced. A complex, multifaceted picture of cadre movement lies behind these indexes: both the process of their natural growth, intensified most recently, and the "horizontal" transfer of workers, for various reasons, together with the movement of a certain number of cadres who have had to be decisively dismissed.

What has been the result of this? First, there has been a considerable rejuvenation of the leading party cadres--the number of CPSU gorkom and raykom secretaries aged up to 40 has increased from 27 to 43 percent. Second, there are women among the secretaries in every raykom and gorkom, and also among the chairmen of the gorispolkoms and rayispolkoms and their deputies. Third, there are now more economic specialists on the party and soviet staff.

Qualitative changes are also taking place in the composition of economic leaders. Thus, all directors and their deputies and all chief engineers at machine-, instrument-, and machine tool-construction enterprises in the kray have a higher education and great experience in practical work. In light, textile and local industry 90 percent, and in the food industry 85 percent of

enterprise leaders have higher education and good practical experience behind them. The majority of leaders in construction also have a higher education.

In agriculture, the specific proportion of koklhoz chairmen and sovkhos directors in the kray with a higher education has reached 97 percent. All these leaders are party members and specialists in the national economy. It must be said that during the first 4 years of the 11th Five-Year Plan period alone, 9,676 specialists were channeled into the agrarian sector, including 3,083 with a higher education. As a result it has been possible to significantly raise the level of qualification not only among farm leaders, but also across the middle strata. Here 76 percent of the posts are now held by agricultural specialists. And 90 percent of the posts of department heads and leaders of complex brigades are filled by specialists. In sum, 3,390 leaders of departments, brigades and farms have had to be replaced, which comprises more than half of the total number of workers in these categories.

The services sphere had been appreciably renewed and strengthened by cadres. Here the number of leaders and specialists with a higher and secondary specialized education has increased by 16-20 percent.

The educational and political level of leaders and specialists in the law protecting organs has risen considerably. During 1983-1984, a significant number of responsible workers who compromised themselves with violations of socialist legality and the norms of Soviet morals had to be replaced. At the same time a large detachment of communists and Komsomol members was channeled into the organs of internal affairs alone.

Generally speaking, one does not now have to search for people with a higher education and specialist diplomas. Sometimes, however, one falls to thinking: "Have we not become conceited or lax, possessing the wealth we do? The number of diploma specialists is steadily growing--what more is there?"

This very "more" does exist, sharply reminding us of it. It is called unity of knowledge and convictions. Even a person with the most extensive knowledge is an unknown quantity as an individual until his beliefs manifest themselves in real practice, in concrete actions. That is why, however impressive it may appear, one "objective criterion" alone is not enough when selecting cadres.

It is no secret that a worker who is an agitator and a fighter on a rostrum can be a philistine in everyday life. It must be admitted that such people are the direct costs or, to be more precise, the defective products primarily in our work to educate young people. A person is not born two-faced--he becomes two-faced. Sometimes, by virtue of external, "favorable" circumstances, so to speak, and certain traits of character, a person (most likely of all and most frequently under the influence of not the best example) channels all his energy from his school or student years onwards into "earning and making a list of good points for himself." The experience of life shows that such people are extremely dangerous to the cause.

With age and maturity many immature passions in young people disappear as a rule. However, sometimes the split in personality and the gap between knowledge and convictions widens, turning into an insuperable abyss, an abyss

between knowledge and world outlook, between word and deed. In such people, their knowledge--sometimes fairly extensive--is like a domestic library, all interest in which is simply reduced to quickly finding the volume needed on the shelf at the necessary moment and opening the necessary page to the "right" quote suitable to the event. Once the event is over the book once again sits gathering dust on the shelf, and life goes on in striking contradiction to the world of wise ideas and lofty truths.

However distressing it may be, the number of such people is considerable. Unfortunately, it is difficult to recognize them immediately, and even more difficult to reeducate and refashion them. That is why the "questionnaire" approach in cadre selection is so insidious, and the "cloister" study of cadres so dangerous.

We will not pass off as a discovery that well-known and indisputable fact that genuine class, ideological conviction is characteristic of people whose origins lie in a working environment, of those who learned the value of work at an early age. A truly moral character is formed in the close union and firm cohesion of theoretical knowledge, ideological conviction and practical experience, which are acquired in the process of socially useful work and spiritual growth, in the process of mounting the ladder of labor and social activity. To find precisely such a person, support him, and aid his formation and social-value development, as well as the realization of all his creative potential--this, perhaps, comprises the very essence of party work with the cadres and is an important aspect of all party work.

While pondering the problem of how and where to seek, and how to prepare, cultivate, and educate practical, ideologically strong, highly moral workers, we turn again and again to the great Lenin. In order to know people, Vladimir I'lich wrote, one must "watch over them, be responsible for them, unite and lead them in practice--for this one must be everywhere, fly everywhere, see everyone in practice, at work" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 46, p 213). To select workers according to their practical and political qualities, test them in practice and move them from the simplest of tasks to the most difficult--these are the indispensable components of cadre work, according to Lenin.

But we are all human, we are not ensured against human weaknesses! How can one guard against subjective and biased appraisals? Without foregoing adherence to principle, how can one preserve sensitivity; while trusting, how can one not be ashamed of checking, controlling and questioning; while respecting, how can one call to account and punish; while erring, how can one learn to admit mistakes, answer for them and rectify them?

To some, perhaps, such questions appear trivial and not sufficiently serious, but, as experience has taught, in this cartridge every shot must hit the target. One miss and a flaw, a weakness, a crack will appear in the choice of individual, leader, organizer, cadre worker. Practice provides a considerable number of such dismal examples.

Thus, during the last 2 years, up to one-third of the leaders have been replaced in the krayispolkom administrations of the food industry and grain

production, and also in the Kubanvino Association. Of course, not all of them were dismissed for unsuitability, but the majority were dismissed for precisely this reason. One can speak of both the guilt of these workers themselves, who succeeded in concealing their incompetence for a time, and of the mistakes of the party committees, which selected unsuitable people for advancement without having worked with them sufficiently or given them proper support. In one way or another, the damage was done. At least the error was quickly rectified. Otherwise, this is what happens: A leader does not deal with the matter for a year or two, and he drags his economic unit along for 3-5 years. The party committees and soviet organs see this and...reconcile themselves to the state of affairs. For the moment, as the saying goes, the thunder is still far off.

I recently had occasion to meet with a certain kolkhoz chairman. He has been running this farm for many years now, and all this time with an excellent reputation. Just listen to what people say about him: sensitive, attentive, responsive, thoughtful and so on. However, as soon as one touches on economic matters it turns out that the kolkhoz has multimillion debts. One asks oneself: What has moved the leaders of the rayon for so many years? This, unfortunately, can be frequently encountered. Year after year an enterprise fails to fulfill the plan, an apology for a leader ruins matters for all to see--yet he still manages to keep his hand in. What is more, he contrives to "use credit" with the higher authorities.

Incidentally, since we have begun talking about the plan, at this point another very complex question arises that relates to cadre work. We all know that the plan is law and determines the development of every unit of our socialist society. One must not fail to fulfill the plan--it is inadmissible. Does this mean that whoever fails to ensure plan fulfillment by his labor collective is a bad leader? Does it follow that he must be replaced by another? Well, and what if the same thing happens with a second and a third leader? It is not secret that in real economic practice we encounter both intensive, but realistic plan tasks and also excessively high, unbalanced and sometimes even excessively low plan tasks. But do we always reach the real, deep causes and its leader? An intensive, but realistic, balanced plan must become the law of socialist economic operations. Raising the standard of planning is one of the central tasks of the work in progress in the country to perfect our entire economic mechanism. We party workers cannot stand aside, patiently awaiting the end of this long and difficult work. The plan is our common concern, we are all responsible for it and must not overlook formalism in planning--we do not have the right. We are obliged to struggle against every manifestation of such formalism. Only then will we be able to give a simple answer to the question of whether we are in the right to leave a leader in his post when he fails to ensure plan fulfillment. Confidence in the practicability of the plan makes it possible to clarify a great deal in cadre work and to avoid subjectivity in the evaluation of the practical qualities of economic leaders. This problem still awaits a satisfactory solution.

Broad publicity in the evaluation, selection and advancement of a leader--this, as the whole of our previous experience in socialist construction shows, makes it possible to avoid subjectivity and other sins of the questionnaire-cloister approach in cadre work. In his draft "Mandate From the

Council for Labor and Defense to Local Soviet Institutions," Lenin pointed out: "Now the 'master' is the worker-peasant state, and it must broadly, systematically, and openly arrange the matter of selecting the very best workers in economic construction, administrators and organizers on a specialized and general, local and all-state scale" (op. cit., vol 43, p 280).

Today we are learning to do this even more persistently. A method of openly considering and selecting cadres is now being introduced in the kray on a broad, systematic basis. The essence of this work, perhaps, can be most clearly perceived in the example of the Krasnodar city party organization.

A reserve of cadres for nomination, formed by the party committees and primary party organizations, is the basis for open selection. The problem of considering a candidate for a leading post in a collective is decided by the rayon or city party committee together with higher economic organs as vacancies occur. For cadres in the middle strata, this issue is decided by the party committee (party bureau) of the primary, workshop party organization together with the leadership of the plant, workshop, sector and so on depending on the concrete post.

It could be said that the proposed method conceals the danger of sliding toward endless discussion. Yes, this would be a real danger if the matter were allowed to drift. However, this does not happen because selecting cadres by the method of open discussion is totally under the control of the party organizations. Collective discussion of the practical and moral-political qualities of a worker nominated for a leading post is preceded by the submission of his candidacy to the party and economic organs. At this preliminary stage, the nomination of a candidate for a post (irrespective of whether the post is included in the schedule of appointments of the party committee or not) first takes place in the departments and with the raykom secretaries, then in the corresponding departments and with the party gorkom secretaries. Only after a positive opinion on the candidate has been given by all participants in the nomination process can the candidate be considered in the collective. Candidacies for nomination from among middle strata cadres are submitted within the framework of the enterprises.

In large collectives the discussion of candidates for leading posts is held at an extended session of the party committee or bureau with the invitation of leading specialists, representatives of the party and trade union aktiv, and veterans of the enterprise. In smaller collectives this is done at open party meetings. The collective is notified of the time of the discussion well in advance. The session or meeting is recorded. If necessary, a personal file and character recommendation compiled from the opinions of those who participate in discussion of the candidate are submitted to a higher organ.

During the last 2 years, more than 1,000 leaders have been appointed in Krasnodar by the method of open selection, including 135 new faces, 30 leaders' deputies, 276 middle strata workers and 400 brigade leaders. This method is by no means a formal procedure. This is attested to by the fact that in the course of collective discussion 150 candidates were rejected.

Approximately 60 economic leaders have been nominated in Sochi in the past year by the method of open selection. This method is being introduced in Novorossiysk, Slavyansk-na-Kubani, Yeysk, Tikhoretsk and other cities and rayons in the kray. It should be noted that having promoted a worker to a leading post, the party committees and organizations do not place a full stop at this point and "wash their hands of the matter," but constantly control the process of formation, support and teach the new leader, and systematically hear his accountability reports on work done and on the situation in the collective.

It is important to emphasize that accountability reports at party bureau and party committee sessions, and at party and general meetings of the labor collectives are becoming the norm of life not only for newly appointed leaders, but for all leaders. Thus, during 1983-84 a total of 450 leaders throughout the kray as a whole presented accountability reports at plenary meetings and sessions of the CPSU gorkom and raykom bureaus and more than 8,500 workers in primary party organizations.

What is more, these accountability reports are presented in a keen and interested manner and are of great benefit to the person presenting the report, the collective and the general cause.

Typical in this respect is the pronouncement of A. G. Chistyakov, head of the locomotive depot at Krasnodar station. While presenting his report, he said: "...I have been appointed to different posts on more than one occasion, but everything is simple: One is given an order and one begins one's duties. Of course, as a communist, I could not work badly. My most recent appointment as head of a depot, when my work comrades, having pointed out my shortcomings in a principled manner at an extended session of the party committee, nevertheless gave the opinion that I would be equal to this work, obliges me to do a great deal, and I will always remember the mandate of my work comrades. This constantly compels me to work to eliminate shortcomings in my character and in my attitude to work, to work with still greater energy, while coordinating my actions with the requirements of the party and the government."

Publicity in cadre selection and the collective discussion of candidates for leading posts do not yet guarantee total success. If one does not hear accountability reports and control both the experienced and the young leader, one can simply lose a worker. There are still a considerable number of such examples: I. P. Shulga was promoted by the method of open selection (with objective and principled discussion) to the post of head of the assembly administration of the Orgpishcheprom Trust. Everything seemed to have been done as it should. The trouble is that the man was promoted and...forgotten. Neither the gorkom nor the raykom remembered him, requested an accountability report, or helped him. He did not present an accountability report to the collective. The outcome was a sorry one: The new leader did not know how to unite the collective, he lost contact with the party organization and came into conflict with the chief specialists of the administration. The conclusion was that communists did not elect their leader to the party bureau at the accountability report election meeting. He had to be dismissed from his post.

We persistently seek methods of effectively controlling and verifying the work of both newly appointed and experienced leaders. Of course, there are spheres of activity that only workers from the control-inspection apparatus can check. Other sectors of economic operations can be relatively easily surveyed by posts and groups of people's control. But there are also some spheres of life where official organs and the conventional, traditional methods of control are simply powerless.

What inspector or people's controller could, for example, throw light on whether a leader is increasing his political and professional knowledge, clearly understands party and government decisions, is interested in the latest achievements of scientific-technical progress and in progressive experience, and is familiar with the collective, people, progressive workers and the needs and concerns of the workers? Or how he relates to his post, what he regards as his party and professional duty and how he evaluates his activities and actions? Whether he goes to extremes or gives himself airs? Whether he has lost contact with people, with the collective?

Who can ask these questions and receive a satisfactory answer to them? Of course, only the party committees. That is why individual talks, which have proved to be highly effective, are everywhere becoming the daily practice of our party organizations. These talks cover various categories of party, soviet and economic leaders.

These talks are conducted systematically. A number of leading cadres are selected each year who are responsible for conducting this work. Plans and schedules are drawn up which determine the time and those responsible for preparing and holding the talks.

During the last 2 years, talks have been held in the city and rayon party committees with almost 22,000 of the 32,000 workers on the party schedule. In the lower party units, talks have been held with 26,000 middle strata leaders and specialists. Secretaries of the party kraykom have held talks with the first secretaries of the rayon and city committees.

Holding these talks is a serious matter and they are prepared seriously. The necessary information and analytical documents are selected. In the course of the talks concrete observations are made on negligence in work, and also on shortcomings in the character, conduct and style of activity of the leader in question. A final document on the talks is placed in the worker's personal file. The observations and recommendations made are recorded in this document and then taken under control.

The experience of the Yeysk City Party Organization, for example, attests to the effectiveness of this kind of control. Here, in the course of talks with a number of leaders, serious observations were made concerning questions of plan discipline and moral-political qualities. The accountability reports of these leaders were heard after a set period of time at the bureau of the city committees. The absolute majority of these leaders had promptly and conscientiously fulfilled the requests made of them during the talks. However, three leaders had to be dismissed--the comrades had not learned any

lessons from their own mistakes. Another eight people were punished according to party procedure. Now matters have improved with them. Generally speaking, discipline among the leading cadres has considerably improved.

The practice of holding talks has become widespread in the Sochi CPSU Gorkom. They help to improve the state of affairs in various sectors of work and to provide a clearer and more detailed picture of a leader. As a result, during 1983-84 a total of 47 leading workers were dismissed from their posts in Sochi. The party aktiv and the whole of the city's population are provided with extensive information on the reasons for the adoption of measures with regard to a leader.

The absolute majority of our leading cadres are communists. Consequently, they are first and foremost political workers, plenipotentiaries of the party, and conductors of its policy among the masses. Entrusting a communist with leadership of a given sector of economic work, we are not simply entrusting him with production organization, but also with organization of the collective and its education. That is why, while testing a worker for political maturity, we also seek, cultivate and develop in him the qualities of an ideological fighter, agitator, propagandist, educator and spiritual mentor.

In this respect, a considerable amount of work has been done in the kray in the course of fulfilling the decisions of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. If one turns to figures, then it turns out that now approximately 1,300 leaders belong to groups of lecturers formed under the party committees, more than 10,500 are propagandists, 650 are lecturers, 6,500 are political information officers, and more than 2,300 are leaders of agitation collectives. Of leading workers in the kray administrations and departments, a total of 109 are kraykom lecturers and 280 conduct propaganda and lecture work.

Political education days, ideological programs, open letter days and various forms of party study make it broadly possible to involve thousands and tens of thousands of people in the ideological-educational process, to establish real contact with the interests of the labor collectives, to be more deeply aware of their needs and concerns, and to be in close practical and spiritual contact with the working people. Of course, not everything runs smoothly in this respect. The party kraykom and all the party committee still have a great deal to do. The first results, as they say, are at hand and they are reassuring.

The kray party committees, and the bureau and secretariat of the CPSU kraykom have increased their attention to such important channels of information on the state of affairs in the field as letters and proposals from the working people, and also publications in the pages of the press, and they react promptly and in a principled manner to facts reported in them and to their appraisals of leaders' practical and moral qualities. As Comrade K. U. Chernenko has graphically said, this "reliable insurance mechanism against voluntarism and subjectivity" is actively utilized in the activities of the kray party committees and teaches "the masses management--not in the abstract or through lectures and meetings, but through practice and the experience of life" (op. cit., vol 37, p 451).

Finally, we devote the closest attention to forming those obligatory qualities of a leader, such as competency and the ability to resolve problems in a state way. This, as is well known, also has to be taught, both in good time and in the process of work. A person does not become a real specialist in his field at the moment he receives his diploma. To become a specialist, he also needs experience in practical work. Well, you cannot become a leader immediately! The time is such that a leader or specialist who was fully equal to his post yesterday, tomorrow could prove to be hopelessly behind if he lets up his efforts, ceases learning and following scientific-technical achievements and rests content with what he once achieved.

The "technology" of errors arising in the promotion of a worker to a leading post is well known. A poor knowledge of people and a superficial approach to the selection of cadres lie behind these errors. Thus, when appointing Yu. N. Skorodumov to the post of director of a plant in Novorossiysk, the party raykom restricted itself simply to acquainting itself with the facts about the economic official provided by the questionnaire which, at first glance, appeared totally suitable. At this point Skorodumov already had three successfully constructed plants to his credit. There was no objective characterization or certification in his personal file. They discussed general topics with him and trusted their first impression. However, the activities of the new director put him in a totally different light. He began to put together the leading staff of the plant under construction by means of inviting specialists from outside and groundlessly promising them that they would be given apartments out of turn. This immediately aggravated relations between the leadership and local cadre workers. Letters and complaints were sent to various institutions. Skorodumov came down hard on those who were dissatisfied and who tried to criticize and correct him. Examining the personal file of the plant director, the party gorkom requested character references on him from his former work places. It became clear that this style of work had always been characteristic of Skorodumov, for which he had been repeatedly punished according to party procedure.

A similar error was made by the Kropotkin CPSU Gorkom, which invited a specialist from Amur Oblast to take up the post of director of a large plant. The mistake had to be paid for dearly afterwards.

At the same time, dozens of examples convincingly attest to the fact that when leading posts are filled by conscientious, enterprising and politically mature workers who have passed through all the stages of growth in these very labor collectives, they become good leaders of enterprises and able organizers and educators. In contemporary conditions, the reserve of leading cadres is virtually inexhaustible. We have a multitude of intelligent, knowledgeable and honest people capable of successfully leading a given sector of work. One must only know how to find them and not be afraid to entrust them with great, responsible tasks.

Until recently the attitude in the kray toward the reserve of cadres was, one could say, formal. Year after year the same old surnames wandered from list to list, while people who had unexpectedly "bobbed to the surface" were frequently appointed to leading posts. Sometimes this was successful, but

more frequently unsuccessful. In order to reduce the probability of mistakes and, with time, eliminate them, we strive to tighten up the process of selecting and preparing candidates in the reserve for nomination, and also to "break it up" into a series of successive stages: collecting information, studying the opinions and evaluations of members of the collective, forming a comprehensive characterization of the proposed candidate on this basis, then training him and placing him on probation, that is, testing him with concrete tasks, at first less, then more complex, and, finally, advancing him and including him on the list of cadres, and further--training him again, holding talks with him, and hearing his accountability reports, which has already been discussed above.

Both the kraykom, the Adyge Obkom, the city and rayon party committees, and also the cadre departments of various administrations and departments have had to thoroughly revise the make-up of the reserve and, in a number of cases, to completely renew it. In 1983 this made it possible to advance almost two-thirds of the reserve to replace nomenklatura workers. In the Anapa and Yeysk CPSU Gorkoms and the Dinskoy, Kanevskiy, Kurganinskiy, Timashevskiy and Ust-Labinskiy CPSU Raykoms replacement was carried out virtually entirely by means of using workers from the reserve.

Percentages apart, the main thing is the content of the work in progress and its final results. For the matter to have a successful outcome, it is utterly essential to know the Leninist principles of work with the cadres and to steadily follow them in practice. It is essential to constantly seek concrete forms and methods that meet contemporary demands for implementing these principles in practice.

All party committees must conduct this search. This work is fairly successfully organized, for example in the Yeysk party organization (basically, if one does not count certain nuances, the same is true of work with the reserve in Sochi, Krasnodar and in the Krasnoarmeyskiy, Slavyanskiy, Leningradskiy and other cities and rayons in the kray).

In Yeysk each gorkom department has selected 25-30 of the most capable, active and skilled specialists who are well regarded in their collective and up to 30 years old. Up to five or six of them are assigned to permanent members of the departments. Once a quarter lectures are given for these workers and twice a quarter practical situation games are held. Candidates for advancement into the cadre reserve pass through a probationary period as nonpermanent gorkom instructors. Talks are held with them and the work they have done reviewed. A session of the gorkom bureau examines and approves the worker's evaluation, in his presence. A 1-year school for the reserve has been set up and fruitfully operates in accordance with a decision of the party gorkom bureau.

In other cities and rayons, such schools and courses operate under the auspices of technical colleges and branches of higher education institutes and on the basis of progressive economic units; they are run in a distinctive way with orientation toward the future activities of the students. In Novorossiysk, the permanent seminar of directors of enterprises and organizations in all branches of the city's economy has well recommended itself.

We do not only regard the reserve as a source for replenishing and renewing the cadres, but also as a connecting link between the party organizations and the labor collectives, and between the organ of government and the broad masses of the working people.

The principle of consistently moving cadres along an ascending line, so to speak, from the bottom up, is closely followed in the Novokubanskiy, Krasnoarmeyskiy and Timashevskiy rayons and in a number of other rayons in the kray. Generally speaking, we strive to make it the system to advance cadres according to this principle.

At the same time, the method of strengthening the lower units with workers who have passed through a solid school of practical activity in the party or soviet apparatus of a kray, oblast, city or rayon unit is also widely practiced. Thus, instructors of the party kraykom are constantly advanced to independent party and soviet work in the cities and rayons. We have also taken action to make the secretary of the party kraykom the first deputy chairman of the krayispolkom and also chairman of the kray agroindustrial association, and two heads of department have been made deputy chairmen of the krayispolkom. The deputy heads of the organization department and the department of administrative organs have been made heads of large, independent work sectors in the krayispolkom's administration of internal affairs. The former first secretary of the Komsomol kray committee has been made head of the Timashevskiy Rayon party organization, where, in accordance with a CPSU Central Committee decision, a large-scale and responsible experiment is now in progress connected with the organization of the Kuban Agroindustrial Combine.

Similar practices are being established in other localities. Thus, during the last 2.5 years in Slavyansk-na-Kubani, a total of 18 workers from the party gorkom apparatus have been channeled into independent party, soviet and economic work. The Gelendzhik Gorkom has appointed 25 people from among its party and Komsomol workers to leading economic posts. The Sochi CPSU Gorkom has strengthened the leadership in the Tsentralniy, Adlerskiy and Lazarevskiy party raykoms by advancing comrades who have passed through a school of organizational party work in the city party apparatus.

There is a multitude of such examples and no need to enumerate them all. It is far more essential to thoroughly understand the present practice, correctly appraise it, and develop a firm opinion on the expediency and ways of further developing this form of cadre policy.

Of course, cadres, as we have just been discussing, are well-trained, experienced people who have been tested many times. It would seem that there could not be any more problems, especially as it is the direct obligation of the party committees to introduce the experience of the more precisely organized higher apparatus into the work of the middle and lower units. Nevertheless, there is a "but": there are not enough cadres trained in this way for strengthening all the sectors that need strengthening. There is also another "but": Not all these people have received an adequate specialized training for work in that branch to which they are sent by the will of the party.

"Any work connected with management," said Lenin at the Third All-Russian Congress of Water Transport Workers in 1920, "requires special qualities. One can be the strongest revolutionary and agitator and a totally useless administrator. He who looks closely at practical life and has experience of life knows that, in order to manage, one must be competent, one must be totally familiar with all production conditions down to the last detail, one must be familiar with the technology of this production at its contemporary stage, and one must have a certain scientific education" (op. cit., vol 40, p 215). How can one carry out Lenin's directions in contemporary conditions?

We have consulted on this matter with the secretaries of the party gorkoms and raykoms. The most diverse opinions have been expressed, but, basically, everyone agrees that party cadres must be thoroughly taught the basics on economic operations and the basics of production organization and management. It has also been suggested that it is time for republican and interoblast higher party schools to not only provide their students with general political education, but also with a specialized education, and that economic faculties should be organized within the framework of the party school or at least that a compulsory 1-year course in the basics of economic organization and management be introduced.

It is also suggested that this course be introduced in all higher education institutes and organizing engineering faculties of cadre services in national economy institutes while definitely including the course "The Work of a Leader" in the program of these faculties.

At that moment, chief emphasis in the kray is placed on organizing a course network for training and improving the qualifications of command production cadres. Such courses are run under the auspices of both the kray and rayon agricultural administrations, agricultural institutes and agricultural technical schools and party committees at industrial enterprises. The trouble is that all this work is still, to put it bluntly, at the amateur stage. There are no scientifically elaborated programs, methods, recommendations, study aids and so forth. Now, since the adoption of a serious, mobilizing resolution by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers--"On Further Perfecting the Improvement of Qualifications of Leading Cadres and Specialists in the System of the Agroindustrial Complex"--many problems have begun to be practically resolved. We see our task as consistently, steadily and efficiently implementing the measures worked out to fulfill this resolution.

Almost all party workers complain of considerable difficulties in bringing to light the personal qualities of future leaders and the degree of their suitability for this role. An opinion has been expressed to involve psychologists, sociologists and pedagogues in the preparation of methods and psychological tests that would help to determine and reveal an individual's potential to be a leader.

A considerable number of complex and sometimes even delicate problems exist today in cadre work. Thus, fairly delicate situations sometimes arise in connection with the fact that the work of a leader and an engineering-

technical worker is remunerated in a number of cases at a lower level than that of an ordinary, albeit skilled workers. A similar difficulty sometimes also arises when advancing chief specialists and middle strata specialists to more responsible work on kolkhozes and sovkhoses. Yet they are the contingent from which the reserve of leading cadres is mainly formed. Material considerations play a role of some significance in the fact that a kolkhoz or sovkhos specialist sometimes refuses to be moved into leading work beyond the limits of his economic unit, but most frequently of all it is a question of shortcomings in educational work with this category of workers and gaps existing, so to speak, in the education of the educators. It is primarily this that explains failures in the selection of people suitable for training and included in the cadre reserve. The party committees come up against failures of this kind virtually in every rayon and city. Such cases are isolated, but they do exist, and consequently we are bound to regard them as a sign of our incomplete work and as a reminder that the party committees must still learn to define an individual not only according to the degree of his professional qualification for leading work, but also according to the real possibilities for educating him and cultivating him as a worker who not only knows his job, but who is totally devoted to it and always remembers that the work sector of which he is in charge is also a part of the great party cause.

Today one can confidently say that the kray possesses good cadres capable of successfully fulfilling party tasks. Evidence of this are the noticeable positive changes in the fulfillment of plans for socioeconomic development. The kray fulfilled ahead of schedule the 1984 plan tasks connected with production and the sale of industrial products, growth in labor productivity and reduction of prime costs. Socialist obligations for the sale to the state of 4,359 thousand tons of grain were overfulfilled ahead of schedule. Tens of thousands of new apartments, as well as new schools, hospitals and preschool institutions were built. New roads, well-equipped streets in villages and towns and greater well-being for workers in the kray attest to the changes for the better.

However, we communists do not have the right to be satisfied with what has been achieved. We must think of the future and show concern for those who have to fulfill increasingly large-scale tasks in the immediate and more distant future. This means that we must persistently seek talented organizers capable of being leaders in contemporary conditions. It also means that we must carefully cultivate and skillfully educate the cadres--the main active force of the party. The CPSU kraykom and the communists of the Kuban persistently work to fulfill this task while preparing for the 27th Congress of our Leninist party.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

CSO: 1802/10

MORAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 84 (signed to press 27 Feb 85) pp 40-51

[Article by Mikh. Lifshits; from the manuscript files of the noted Soviet philosopher and art expert M. A. Lifshits (1905-1983). Abridged--the editor)]

[Text] The historian looks at thousands of documents of the revolutionary age--resolutions of the local soviet bodies, instructions, deputy speeches.... This is a boiling sea of revolutionary activities of the masses, festive energy and historical creativity. What an amazing unity of will, originally expressed, always in its own way, ignoring conventional and universally accepted forms of eloquence!

The principal idea of all documents of the first years of the Great October Socialist Revolution was that of unity. The unity of nations equally tired of the imperialist slaughter, unity among all working people in the face of the divisive power of money and unity between workers and peasants. We were persecuted, set against one another, we were divided and we were slaves. We are no longer slaves because we are united and just try to take us on! This idea prevails everywhere--in speeches on a new international policy, open and honest, without secret diplomatic dirty tricks, without provocations and fight for prestige; it appears in the calls for self-organization to repel the class enemy. It is also where the peasant society is asking for trade with the countryside.

Occasionally we come across naive exaggerations, understandable when coming from people never before involved in politics. A soldier on leave from the Turkish front requests Red literature to be sent to the countryside--"a few programs and most influential and refined proofs and clarifications with which to attain socialism and felicity on earth." The chairman of the extraordinary conference of town and country delegates of a distant uyezd in Nizhegorodskaya Guberniya calls for the peasants "to unite within a single family" in order to repel the enemies of the revolution and preserve its gains. "Stand united and firm, comrades, and do not surrender the freedom gained with blood; hold firmly and highly the labor red flag which will soon rise over the entire world, at which point the heaven on earth which Christ preached about will come."

Although naive to the extreme, such examples culled among many, describe the grandiose scope of the dream of universal fraternity, which had captured the imagination of millions of people.... This was a class morality, for in speaking of fraternity among nations, for example, the revolution was defending above all the right of the oppressed nations and national minorities. This was a morality, for the October Revolution was implementing its own orders in its own home, i.e., it applied them to itself. Revolutionary Russia made such large concessions to the peoples inhabiting the former tsarist empire that, in Lenin's words, this could even sound "Tolstoyan."

The revolution created an unparalleled moral climate on earth, demanding a particularly delicate treatment of the national feelings of previously aggrieved peoples, large and small. This was something truly new and convincing, and such historical facts do not vanish. Nothing can erase them from the hearts of the people--neither slander nor the dirty preaching of division and chauvinism. Without the class morality of the October Revolution the phenomena of national cooperation noted today in the world could not exist.

Disgust for an idle way of life was another moral order of the October Revolution. Previously, people had prided themselves on their ability to live without working, using the services of others. Now they began to feel ashamed of their advantages and at least tried to hide them from others. Even the features of that time, naive from our viewpoint, stand up from belief in the immorality of living like the gentry. Using the services of a porter or a waiter was considered embarrassing.

In precisely the same manner, an ineradicable awareness of individual human dignity, in all its manifestations, became customary. The word "official" is a pejorative label and to be an official or a dignitary, a "sovbur," as Lenin described a chief using "Tit Titych's methods," now meant distorting the basic principle of the new social system.

Without talk about charity, the new society recognized the right of the sick to be the concern of others, involving no humiliation but a guarantee by law. No comforting words were said about the poor in spirit. The revolution rejected the old view that education was a source of privileges and special pride. Any cultural advantages obtained at the expense of society imposed the obligation of raising the working people to a higher standard and in turn, offering something to learn to even the most educated person. For the first time, the revolutionary power officially recognized that culture was a means of unifying rather than dividing nations. Anything else was a violation of this principle.

The October Revolution laid the foundations for comradely solidarity among all people, regardless of sex and age. It displayed its class nature by defending not in words but in actions the interests of women and children, for the new state deemed itself obligated to restore justice for the weak and the humiliated.

We frequently argue about humanism, both abstract and nonabstract. Obviously, sentimental and elegiac statements about goodness can teach no one to become good. They can only help the new hypocritical predators to trick the simpletons. What the contemporary world needs is the observance of the real orders issued by the October Revolution in order to leave far behind it the laws of Moses and Mohammed and the words of grief and love of the blessed Augustine and St. Francis.

No, the world of the October Revolution is not morally poor, and happy is he in whom the fire it started has *not* burned out. Many great truths, familiar since ancient times, were reasserted in the days of the October Revolution, and many of the practical ideas of our revolution were gradually reflected in the fates of working people in distant lands.

In a class-oriented society, large masses of people are lumped together by the iron power of vital needs. The human anthill, in which they have been crowded since the dawn of civilization, were the result not of a moral unity but, rather, of an opposite force--*division* and struggle for private interests. The history of the world tells us how tremendous social forces came out of this division. However, with *such* a form of progress little space remained for a more specific unity and direct warmth of moral relations. My family, my neighbor, my friend, my guest.... The very atmosphere of morality becomes cooler and thinner when spread *among* broader relations among people.

The influence of religious *morality* is determined by the fact that it satisfies the thirst for direct and voluntary ties among people in its own way. The people hate an official approach to relations. It leaves them cold. Religious morality meets this need but, whatever its defenders may say, it meets it with helpless daydreaming. Religion offers escape with ceremonious kissing, conventionally emphasized personal well-wishingness and common veneration of the ascetic self-sacrifice *of* a few supporters, who redeem the sins of the laymen without *changing* anything in essence, for religion proceeds from the deep division among people and their basic loneliness, not eliminated but rather intensified by society. Actually, it only argues that one person cannot come close to the heart of another without earthly or celestial intermediaries. Even in a family, the basic ownership nucleus, needs a god to prevent a conflict between men and women and old and young. Any compromise between uneven forces needs protection. That is why religious morality, despite its orientation toward the soul, contains a substantial dose of officialdom warmed up by nothing. All the efforts of the various sects and free religious societies have broken down in the face of this obstacle, which Dostoyevskiy described in his poem "The Great Inquisitor."

It is only on the grounds of a democratic upsurge and, particularly, the thrusts of enthusiasm generated by popular uprisings that a real moral field developed, sweeping off the insignificant barriers dividing people and the obstacles which must truly be destroyed, once their hypocritical phraseology has been eliminated. The *revolution* means the blending of social long-term with immediate actions. It means the joint intervention by the people in their own life, stolen from them. "Embrace, millions of people!" wrote Schiller, under the influence of the revolutionary events of the end of the 18th century.

Splendid words of universal fraternity were then said in the hymn to freedom. Subsequently, however, Shiller named it "Ode to Joy." Was this because the French Revolution did not justify the hopes of the best people of its time or else because the great poet failed to understand the historical zigzags, which had begun during the Terror and ended with Napoleon's personal power?

The revolutionary power in France fell not because it allowed the extremes of the Terror but because the revolution failed to find the true key to the unification of the masses and to rally them against the big and the even more dangerous petty parasites.

In reading Lenin, we see that he kept before him the example of the French revolution and that the danger of the victory of selfish interests over the unity of the people's masses seemed to him greater than a military conflict with any enemy power. The plow of the October Revolution plows deeper, but the deeper the destruction of the old, the smaller its fragments and the more urgent became the need for a new, a higher type of social ties. If by destroying the major predators the revolution would merely unleash petty appetites and open the way to numerous petty plunderers of the social good, it would fail to achieve its purpose. This thought runs throughout Lenin's articles and speeches of the post-October period.

In his speech at the Third All-Russian Komsomol Congress Lenin rejected abstract morality. Thousands of years had proved that moral rules were too weak to achieve a comradely solidarity among people.... The preaching of high moral values and loyalty and purity by themselves do not solve the problem, even if such qualities are preserved, despite the threat of death, in the select environment of the most-tried revolutionaries. "History is familiar with conversions of all sorts; to rely on convictions, loyalty and other excellent spiritual qualities cannot be considered serious. Excellent spiritual qualities are found in a small number of people, but it is the huge masses who determined historical outcomes and who, unless that small number of people do not join them, occasionally do not treat very politely that small number of people" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 45, p 94).

The tragedy of the older revolution was that it triggered a wave of social solidarity but only to a certain limit. Beyond that limit the more or less sharply marked class gap between the revolutionary power and the unsatisfied energy of the masses, inevitable under the former immature historical conditions, opened. As this power became imperceptibly contaminated by the officialdom of the old governmental institutions, the unity of social will declined, turning into an indifference felt by the majority, and hostility toward unmasked benefactors. The usual outcome of such backward movements was an orgy of White terrorism and a wave of regressive feelings, withdrawal into personal life and return to God.

"The socialist revolution has begun," Lenin said at the start of 1918. "Now everything depends on developing comradely discipline, not the discipline of the barracks or the capitalists, but the discipline of the toiling masses themselves" (op. cit., vol 35, pp 309-310). It is more difficult to create a

new comradely discipline than to lead the masses against landowners and capitalists. However, harder though it may be, this task is the only key to true communist success.

The new society can gauge its successes only to the extent to which its laws become part of the specific life of the people, their personal possession and a matter of close concern, rather than remaining in the area of external facts and bookish phraseology. The better the common principles of communism coincide with the immediate feeling of comradeship, the more they are implemented and the more distant they become from the old-type official discipline.

Lenin understood perfectly that our revolution must resolve a tremendous human problem, for communism, as he wrote even before the October Revolution, "presumes not the current labor productivity or the current type of philistine who can waste the public wealth and demand the impossible 'for the sake of nothing,' like Pomyalovskiy's seminarists" (op. cit., vol 33, p 97). It is difficult even to conceive of the scale of this task. The character of the seminarist, who displays his personality through the senseless waste of public funds, who scorns official science in which he is trained and who knows thousands of tricky ways to avoid it, who is poisoned by a feeling of revenge against society, dangerous in his arbitrary behavior, treachery and petty power-seeking, is of universal historical significance. We find his real prototypes in Kant's "radical evil," the nightmare of the educated people of the French Revolution.

Pomyalovskiy's reader knows that the seminarist was the unfortunate creation of barracks discipline of the old society, the complete product of the tsarist school.

Had this savage being been allowed to rush to freedom as he had been shaped by the old seminary, many of the expectations recorded in the book of social life with the blood of the heroes, and realistic from the viewpoint of objective historical necessity, could turn into mockery. Everything that is best on earth would be related to such a person with the memory of official drilling, therefore disgusting and worthy of profanity. This would make the great chemist Lavoisier lose his head and even the statues at the cathedral in Strasbourg would fall down....

The deeper the historical changes are the more dangerous becomes this mixture of elemental forces of "rejection for nothing," in Lenin's familiar expression.

The October Revolution set a human problem, which all moral systems in the world had tried to resolve abstractly, on real historical grounds. The dream appeared attainable. Suffice it to turn to Lenin, however, to realize how cautiously he spoke of such a possibility and the time it would take.

The initial steps of the Soviet system were taken in the circumstance of the masses running wild, triggered by the world war. War corrupts the people. It creates conditions favorable for the "tramps and semitramp elements." They look at the revolution as a "means of abandoning the old way and taking out of

it all they can." The struggle for such "elements of breakdown of the old society," in Lenin's words, added to widespread Makhnovism is a great page of revolutionary heroism. It is much more complex, profound and internal, if one may say so, than the simple institution of a firm revolutionary order.

"The incredible inveterate and obsolete nature of tsarism created (assisted by the blows of a most difficult and painful war) an incredible destructive power aimed against it" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 41, p 12). What direction would this force take in the course of the revolution? Will it become the motive principle which will energize and give new shape to the organization of life, or would such forms become an official screen concealing the indifference and malice of the petit bourgeois, similar to Pomyalovskiy's seminarist? Will this element destroy "brick by brick" factories and plants and the palaces and libraries of the old world? In April 1918 the proletarian leader said that "capitalism has left us as its legacy, particularly in a backward country, a host of the type of customs in which anything that belongs to the state or the government is considered material for malicious destruction" (op. cit., vol 36, p 265).

In the old Russia big capital, linked with landed estates and tsarist bureaucracy, ruled a huge mass of a divided petit bourgeois population. The 25 million peasant homesteads, which appeared as a result of the division of the land after the revolution, created a new petty ownership atomic boiler. This fact had now to be taken into consideration.

In the old official world, even a criminal action was a primitive form of protest, which created a feeling of sympathy for the convict. However, the habit of engaging in "negative actions," like Bakunin and his friends, which had sunk deep roots into the life of the people, inevitably had to become an obstacle on the path to the loftier objectives of communism. It threatened to limit the social upsurge within the framework of a quite vast and popular but still bourgeois revolution.

The socialist revolution cannot hope for success without the voluntary organization of the overwhelming majority, and even the most decisive and extensive elimination of the old world order is not in itself a guarantee that it will not be restored in another form. That is why the communist principle of the October Revolution could be manifested only wherever "Russian aimless chaos and stupidity," the opposite side of traditional despotism, could be replaced by conscious social relations aimed at the unification of millions of people.

Something else as well existed in the vast popular sea. Two forms of unleashed mass energy clashed once again against each other in a state of irreconcilable conflict. It was precisely here, rather than in open combat against the military power of the landowners and capitalists, that ran the main watershed. The October upsurge unraveled the tight moral knot tied by preceding history, and the conscious vanguard of the country had to tie it once again, properly this time. This was no easy task, for it was known even since Dobrolyubov's time, that it was easier to defeat the foreign than the domestic Turk.

The most dangerous enemy today is closer and is among us, Lenin said, persistently and tirelessly repeating his warnings. He is no longer the old White Guard, with his clear class appearance, or the capitalist. No, he is worse. He is worse precisely because of his indistinctive and imperceptible nature. He is "the enemy who has caused the fall of all previous revolutions." In facing him, "the revolution faces a precipice against which all previous revolutions have come and retreated" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 44, p 162).

Lenin emphasized with his typical energy the significance of the new and particular phenomena of the class struggle, incomprehensible from the viewpoint of bookish Marxism. After throwing outside our borders 2 million White Guards, we had to conquer our own forces and motivations, to burn ourselves up, to triumph "over our own sluggishness, slackness and petit bourgeois egotism and the habits which accursed capitalism had left to the worker and the peasant as its legacy" (op. cit., vol 39, p 5).

The word "egotism" is frequently encountered in Lenin and, unquestionably, his words regarding the petit bourgeois element which cannot be sensibly organized, has a moral hue. However, Lenin's formulation of the problem has nothing in common with the condemnation of egotism which turns the statement concerning the vestiges of bourgeois society into a disciplinary morality, aimed against the interests and attractions of masses of real individuals, who represent the people in their totality. Conversely, the witch's cauldron of the petit bourgeois element does not exclude in the least, in Lenin's eyes, the rebirth of the old conventional discipline, which suppressed the individual allegedly for the sake of the good of the state or in the name of even the most revolutionary-sounding yet excessively general ideas.

There obviously are objects of the class struggle which, in themselves, give priority to the moral question. In the final account, the human characteristics have a historical origin. However, having appeared, they become a factor of life and influence the course of history. It is precisely after the revolution that differences among people and the selection of people and the social forms it takes that become most important.

Since adapting to the new system becomes advantageous from the material viewpoint and convenient in terms of satisfying one's damaged self-esteem at the expense of others, and in the course of the struggle for prestige, the line of demarcation, sharply drawn by Lenin between the "true communist" and the rebellious petit bourgeois, sufficiently energetic to participate in social reorganization yet incapable of moral unity, easily following his own path of careerism, predatoriness and demagogery, exploiting the revolutionary situation to his own advantage, appears.

"Everyone knows," Lenin said, "that ever since we won many of the enemy are among the 'friends' of bolshevism. Entirely unreliable elements, swindlers, who vacillate politically, who sell and betray frequently, attach themselves to us.... When the mensheviks blame us for the fact that many of the Soviet employees who have come to us are dishonest, even in the general civic meaning of the term, we answer them: where could we find better ones, how to do so that the best people would immediately trust us? A revolution which would win

and convince immediately and be immediately trusted by the people does not exist" (op. cit., vol 37, pp 227-228).

As all of Lenin's activities show, he passionately sought the possibility of drawing into social management the best elements in society. He enumerated these elements in his last article: first, "progressive workers"; second, truly enlightened elements, about whom one could vouch that they will not accept a single word on faith or say nothing conflicting with their conscience" (op. cit., vol 45, p 391). Lenin frequently expressed his mistrust of the "worst members of the bourgeois intelligentsia," who used the oscillations of those who had not immediately believed in the revolution to assume important positions in Soviet institutions.

There were two sides to the old class society: the positive and the negative face. The laws governing its existence act as systems of rational norms and abstract truths of law and morality; behind this external cover, however, simmers the element of private interests and a chaotic struggle among forces which know no mercy.

That is why not every rejection of the old has a socialist meaning. Rebellion and revolution are not one and the same. More than a century ago, in connection with the critique of the "philosophy of rebellion" of one of the founders of anarchism, Marx and Engels translated this conceptual difference into the language of real life. There is a type of rejection which can only strengthen a certain order of things by instilling into it fresh forces, represented by rebels, upstarts and anarchists to whom the revolution can say in the words of the poet: "You want freedom for yourselves only."

The hidden internal link between private ownership and crime and the rational norms of the old society, with its irrational element, were expressed by Lenin in his familiar formulas aimed at being understood by the broad human masses: "The rich and the swindlers are two sides of a single coin: they are the two main types of parasites nurtured by capitalism; they are the main enemies of socialism...." "Both, the former and the latter, are blood brothers, children of capitalism, sons of the nobility and the bourgeois society, a society in which a handful of individuals plundered the people and insulted the people, a society in which need and poverty led thousands upon thousands of people to the path of hooliganism, corruption, swindling and loss of a human face...." (op. cit., vol 35, pp 200-201). These simple words are a sharp turn which changes all aspects of the moral life of society.

The old world of wealth and oppression has now left us and its ruling ideology has turned into the chaos of irrational concepts. The ideas previously adopted by anarchism have assumed an important role in it. Lenin realized this during the very first years of the October Revolution, although it was still unclear at that time that this phenomenon with all of its transformations--extreme left and extreme right--and its typical outbursts of social demagoguery could influence an entire age. The rejection of the old organization of life would turn into a rejection of the old disorganization. Socialism rejects the morality of the bourgeois system. However, it cannot win without taming an even more dangerous enemy--the immorality inherent in the old society, free of any kind of norms. The task, which Lenin clearly

earmarked, was to shield the healthy nucleus of the revolution of the masses from all sorts of caricatures of social transformation and the elements of the breakdown of the old society, of the bare "nihilistic rejection" with its atmosphere of violence, aggressiveness and boorishness, frequently depicted as something incorruptibly revolutionary. Down with God, but down with the devil as well!

Also understandable from this viewpoint is the struggle Lenin waged for the development of the type of atmosphere in life in which the popular masses could master "fully and truly" the best classically developed aspect of culture rather than the products of the breakdown of this culture, which could only promote an anarchic rebellion against it. In the words of Lenin, the October Revolution was not an uprising of destructive forces against the human character which had developed in the course of centuries but a strong bulwark of truth, goodness and beauty.

There is nothing amazing in the fact that this turn taken by the revolution toward the positive values of the human world, and the influx of a new popular content, free of hypocrisy and sluggishness, and the revolutionary "negation of the negation," needed even for the sake of preserving life on earth, led to accusing Lenin of conservatism. In an amazing way, the political struggle blended within a single social stream the most radical phraseology of petit bourgeois revolutionism and all kinds of "negative actions" by anarchists and semianarchists, on the one hand, and the rough element of swindling, speculation and simple banditry, on the other. "We must avoid," Lenin said, "anything which could encourage individual abuses.... We must not forget the tremendous harm which any lack of moderation, haste or impatience may cause" (op. cit., vol 38, p 199).

This "lack of moderation" and excessive zeal at someone else's expense, for the sake of promotion and proving oneself, emphasizing official expediency and usefulness, yielding opposite results, faith in issuing orders instead of close work for the comradely unification of the masses in work and in managing the state were all linked, in Lenin eyes, to bureaucratic distortions of the Soviet system. But what nurtures bureaucratism in a revolutionary situation? It is the superstructure dominating a large number of petty and identically centrifugal forces, and the attempt to create unity in the easiest administrative-official way instead of encouraging the true unity of will of the toiling majority. Bureaucratism is a ladder for the ascension of social forces which neither have nor can have any normal emergence on the soil of Soviet democracy.

The study of this danger in Lenin's speeches and works will remain forever a model of profound Marxist dialectics. We are only at the beginning of our understanding of the philosophical and sociological shades of thought which Lenin invested in his works, always caused by urgent practical necessity. The weak mind, which is able to value only the inexpensive trinkets of professorial science, is frequently frightened by the simplicity of this practical mantle. Yet, after Herten and Dostoyevskiy, it was precisely Lenin who revealed through phenomena of a tremendous scale the amazing outcrops of the mentality of the enraged philistine, sick with the grandomania of an insignificant Foma Opiskin.

However, having pointed out that the October Revolution has its most dangerous enemy something greatly resembling the devil in person, Lenin also had to indicate the true way to conquer this evil.

No kind of wealth and no successes in science and technology or anything which could come from them--television sets, refrigerators, automobiles, bright advertising and good consumer services--nothing can save humankind from terrible calamities or sudden falls into a sea of blood and filth unless the people are able to organize their own social affairs, i.e., to replace the official discipline of the old world with a comradely unity among all working people, and release the hidden energy of millions of people. At the peak of personal well-being and in the temporarily sated happiness, each select minority is cautioned by the cruel question: Is this well-being firm and does it rest on a just foundation?

The foes of the October Revolution refuse to grant it "metaphysical depth." They reduce its spiritual content to the idea of usefulness, technology and strength. However, this is applicable only to the fictitious friends of the revolution, and people unknowledgeable of revolutionary theory could err and begin to conceive of it more in the Nietzschean rather than Marxist fashion. The future history of social consciousness will prove the negative role which confused bolshevism with "militancy," noted as early as the first Russian revolution, played after the October Revolution. All familiar forms of exaggerating the expediency of violence historically belong more to the contemporary type of bourgeois ideology with its cult of the devil than to the moral world of the October Revolution.

During the period of the Soviet seizure of power, the October Revolution was the least bloody of all revolutions; however, the armed opposition of reactionary forces and terrorist fire triggered reciprocal intransigence and Red terror. Russia's people's government tried to make a gradual conversion to new social relations without any substantial disruptions. However, the opposite side used everything possible in order, as Lenin said, "to push us into the most extreme manifestation of a desperate struggle" (op. cit., vol 44, p 202).

The argument about violence is one of the more common topics in contemporary social thinking. Sometimes the class forces, whose rule is sufficiently firm has no need for open violence, for such rule is based on economic power, the division of the nation, customary obedience to the traditional order and other similar facts. However, the calm born of strength does not give the strong any moral right to be proud of his peaceableness, the more so since he shows his teeth the moment this becomes necessary. Therefore, the propaganda of bourgeois liberalism is hypocrisy or, at best, naivete. In itself, violence is disgusting. However, the resolve to take up arms in a just cause is a sign of courage.

Is there a difference between murder for the sake of robbery and the murdering of the user of force? Lenin asked. Indeed, how to answer this question which demands a straight choice? With the idea of nonviolent opposition to evil? However, even the supporters of this theory procured tanks and airplanes for

themselves the moment they set up their state. With the ideal of pure science? In recent decades, however, science has become so involved in worldly affairs, that it is being abused today no less than is any radical idea. To assume the blame for one's age, inventing for its sake frightening definitions, such as the age of disaggregation, "age of alienation" and "age of fear" offers no solution to the serious mind and is nothing but moral posturing.

Under certain circumstances, violence is an inevitable although difficult necessity. However, the essence of the revolution consists of violence only if looked upon from the petit bourgeois viewpoint. Actually, it is only one of its aspects, by no means the main one. This was the thought which Lenin persistently tried to instill in the minds of the communists, his supporters, even while the flames of the civil war were raging around them.

Could violence be avoided? There is a way. It consists of the actual observance of comradely discipline by the toiling masses instead of the official suppression of their autonomous activities, which was inherent in the old society and which triggered a corresponding reaction of indifference, malice and reciprocal intransigence. Historically, the working class is a unifying class. Such is its social role in terms of the tremendous majority of the population.

What should be done for such a unification, lifted to a tremendous height by the great thrust of the October Revolution, to convert society into a unified force, rather than breaking down into individual parts, parts which are concerned only with their own affairs and are enraged against others and against society itself? This is the principal meaning of Lenin's familiar speech on the tasks of the youth union. "The education of the communist youth should consist not of presenting it with all kinds of pleasing speeches and morality rules. This is not what upbringing means" (op. cit., vol 41, p 313). It is possible to educate only through live participation in common projects and the active self-organization of all working people against parasites, egotists and petty owners. Lenin tirelessly repeated these simple words of broad mass policy, which reflected the great turn of available social energy toward communist comradeship and true universal enlightenment. "Communist" is a Latin word deriving from the word "common." To be a communist means to enhance the active forces of the people, to unite them, and to create a cohesive, unified and voluntary organization. The old abstract morality did not prove itself. "To the communist, morality lies in cohesive and united discipline and conscious mass struggle against the exploiters" (ibid.).

We face a tremendous historical act. The untouchable reserve of strength created by the October coup proved itself during all subsequent years and has retained its significance to this day, despite all efforts of its enemies and false friends. Meanwhile, unparalleled trials and extremely complex turns were experienced. Was there anything that old Mother History failed to invent during these decades! Entire generations have left the stage, including people who had retained their superior spiritual qualities and people who had lost them, and simply accidental people. The historical outcome, however, is resolved by the masses, even though it may not seem so on the surface. Most

importantly, they continue to resolve it, and whatever lies ahead will be resolved by them to the end.

The foundations which were laid in October 1917, and which met with a response in the hearts of millions of people, who felt close to them, guaranteed the firmness of a new system. This was not progress based on the distant social future, which would define the path of the individual regardless of his will. On the contrary, this opened the gates for the active participation of an infinite mass of people in big policy and created the direct blending of their will with the course of events. The depth of achieved results is always determined by the extent to which the overall plan for historical progress, colored by immediacy of action, has become part of the flesh and blood of the people, for it is only something concrete that has any force and can preserve it even despite most amazing transformations.

Once the people have felt that they can be comrades in the joint management of their own lives you cannot delete this from their awareness either by brute force or any kind of hypocrisy. Occasionally, such awareness may be slumbering or express itself unexpectedly and strangely. Its presence, however, is unquestionable. This the main capital of the October Revolution.

The force of unity, which the October Revolution created, continued to operate regardless of distance or even extremely difficult circumstances. It operates even where people are cautious and have reason to be of two minds. Many things could oppose it in such a case, but only the blind could deny its existence. In our days, even clergymen and members of religious organizations and those who preach passive resistance to evil, while rebuking the communist world for its shortcomings, are forced to come increasingly closer to it.

After more than 6 decades since the October Revolution, we can say that mankind has found no other solution or moral force which could raise the question of the justification of human life with such an irresistible honesty as Lenin's sober revolutionary morality, free of all posturing. However, it is obvious today that the world will never find a way out of the contemporary historical purgatory without true awareness of the moral example set by the October Revolution.

Frequent Western writings claim that the hardening of the struggle is a specific feature of Russian history. However, so-called democratic socialism failed to save even the most culturally advanced countries from bloody dictatorships of the Dollfuss and Hitler type, and the very relative successes achieved by the socialist parties, which reject violence, would have been simply impossible without the defeat of the Hitlerite military machine in 1945. Despite all its contradictions, trials and harshness of the path which our people had to cover, the October Revolution moved mankind forward more than the humane speeches of the peaceful socialists. Although the day after the October Revolution no world revolution took place, as awaited by the masses in the midst of civil war and dislocation, a global reform did. This was a side result of the unparalleled sacrifices made by our people for the common cause of socialism.

Holding on to the brink of the precipice, stockholders and large owners became "better" and granted concessions. Everywhere the worker masses benefitted, for the example of revolutionary Russia was too dangerous to the bourgeoisie. The improved living standards of millions of people, which broadened the domestic market, in turn influenced the faster development of production forces. No one can deny the specific accomplishments of contemporary capitalism and no one can deny the unquestionable fact that the owning classes became involved in this process by force, against their will. However, it was not force which played the main role in the historical shifts of our time. Let us not forget above all that at the beginning of the revolutionary age material advantages were on the side of the reactionary classes. The Soviet system seemed immeasurably weaker than its opponents, both economically and militarily, weaker in terms of weapons and money. However, it was far superior to the hostile camp by its fascination. It was as though purposefully history had created a trial in which moral superiority and material force were disparate. Lenin, the great sober and realistic politician, who scorned helpless phraseology of abstract morality, emphasized this fact frequently. What had helped the Russian worker to withstand the unparalleled privations which became his lot? "Never has the country reached such a state of fatigue and burnout as now. What gave this class the moral strength to survive such privations?" Lenin answered the question as follows: "The moral strength of the Russian worker was that he knew, he felt the aid and support in this struggle given to him by the proletariat of all progressive countries in Europe." He also said that "relying on this support, our proletariat, weak in numbers, worn out by disasters and privations, came out the winner, for it is strong with its moral force" (op. cit., vol 43, pp 133-135).

Even more important from the theoretical viewpoint was the definition of moral strength which Lenin gave in another speech, in 1921. "Economically and militarily, we are immeasurably weaker. Morally--naturally, not in terms of abstract morality but as a ratio among the real strength of all classes in all countries, we are the strongest. This was proven in fact and is being proven not in words but in actions. This has been already proven, and should history take a certain turn, it will be proven repeatedly" (op. cit., vol 44, p 300). Therefore, moral force has its objective content which is more universal and unquestionable than the simple quantity of material facilities put on the balance. Moral force here is a historical, a class relation. Nevertheless, it is a value which can grow, which must be cared for like the apple of one's eye, for it is also possible to waste it and lose it totally. Yet nothing can take the place of this object of great value--wealth, cleverness or weapons. Without it, all of this would lead to no good.

Three viewpoints clashed in the assessment of moral strength. First, the old sentimental-petit bourgeois concept, with its abstract understanding of freedom and justice, that which Lenin described as "blindness toward commodity production." Any kind of abuse of power, scandal and error in building the new life strengthened this position psychologically, on the one hand. On the other, the observance of formal democracy could give the stronger party, i.e., the international bourgeoisie and all opponents of the Soviet system within the country, the possibility of organizing themselves for a counterrevolutionary coup. An uneven ratio of forces, bloody reprisals and

restoration of capitalism hid behind the general well-meaning phraseology of the old morality. This should not be forgotten today also.

Second is replacing the struggle against bureaucratism and in defense of democracy with talks about "production role" and "revolutionary expediency." This view was presented by proxy in the course of the trade union debate.

Third is the viewpoint expressing the main line of the October Revolution, based on the universal ratio among classes in the world.

To Lenin the working class was not an egotistical social group which could see itself only in the mirror of its interests. The area in which true class consciousness operates is always the link between the universal and the reflection of class forces and relations in the entire society. Lenin's letter to G. Myasnikov, dated 5 August 1921, discusses the practical side of this "general class assessment." "How could you," Lenin writes, "slide from a general class assessment, i.e., from the viewpoint of assessing relations among all classes, to a sentimental petit bourgeois assessment? This is a mystery to me" (ibid., p 80). This formulation of the matter would not appear new to anyone who well remembers Lenin's "What Is To Be Done?"

Therefore, moral force has a content. It is determined by the attitude of a given class toward the social entity. Since this attitude is objective, it cannot be amended through the simple stress of the will of interested social forces or through violence, cleverness or money. A moral force can be achieved through the active unification of the majority in opposing the parasites, at which point mutual support and a feeling of fraternity can make miracles. Or else, it could exist only ideally, i.e., as a simple possibility. This offers an extensive area of activity for the human will. Providing, however, that this will does not enter into a hopeless conflict with a historically objective moral force, and not violate conditions under which the latter could be realized in the true unification and fraternal upsurge of the people or trigger through its actions opposite results.

There are no miracles in history. Great turns do occur, sometimes unexpected and so rich in historical content as to appear like true miracles. The unbearable nature of social oppression wherever capital still rules is triggering today a tremendous mass force which frightens the philistine and is truly fraught with great difficulties unless it is let loose. This force, however, is also the great hope of mankind. It can break through the bloody net of international injustices and lift the people above the level of their struggle for advantages, careers or existence and rally them as a majority, despite all differences, with a single will for a clear action. This is possible. Would you like to see an example of such a "miracle?" Look at the October Revolution.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/10

THE PZPR AND THE LENINIST IDEOLOGICAL LEGACY

AU220601 KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 85 (signed to press 27 Feb 85) pp 52-62

[Article by Marian Orzechowski, candidate member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and rector of the PZPR Academy of Social Sciences]

[Text] The struggle for socialism in Poland, for the consolidation of its foundation, and for the creation of bridgeheads for its further development is entering a new phase.

After a period of bitter and difficult ordeals, the PPR is gradually emerging from the crisis and overcoming its consequences. The PZPR is more and more efficiently fulfilling its leading role in relation to the workers class, society and the state.

Profound changes are taking place within the PZPR itself. It has become stronger from an ideological point of view and is consolidating its ranks on the basis of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism. Having rid itself of people ideologically alien and politically passive, the party has become stronger from an organizational viewpoint and also more active and capable of offensive action. Its worker nature is consistently growing stronger. The faith of the workers class in the party is growing. The increasing number of young workers joining the party is a reflection of this in particular.

However, the scale of the tasks facing the PZPR, society and the state is not limited to the framework of the past few years and the immediate future. The domestic and international conditions of their fulfillment are extremely difficult as before. In view of this, perceptions and appraisals of the path trodden cannot help but be diverse in nature. All this is taking place not in a social vacuum and not outside of class antagonism on a national and international scale.

The class enemy is not retreating without a struggle. He is resorting to new methods and forms of struggle in order to slow down the process of stabilization, sow mistrust in the party and the people's power and create new hotbeds of social unrest. Enjoying the comprehensive support of international imperialism, he tries to find support in the Catholic church and does find it amongst extremist, openly anticommunist members of the clergy.

New tasks in the cause of socialist construction are arising before Poland, its working people and the PZPR leading them. Implementing the 3-year plan for stabilizing the national economy and economic reform and gradually improving the material position of the working people--all this is a necessary condition for strengthening the already existing foundations of the new system, intensifying the socialist content and perfecting the forms of social life and developing the prerequisites for building mature socialism.

Mature socialism, developing on its own basis which is being constantly perfected, is the strategic aim of the PZPR for the coming decades. By virtue of their very essence, this aim and this process are calculated for a long period. Our party struggles against any tendencies to weaken the dynamics of socialist changes and to consolidate the state of the transitional period, and also against the setting of premature tasks for which the objective conditions have not yet matured.

The ideas of V. I. Lenin and his ideological legacy are an invariable and reliable compass for the PZPR in its struggle to achieve its strategic aims. This legacy has special significance for Polish communists.

First, Lenin was familiar with Poland and many Poles--figures in the Polish and international workers movement, was interested in the Polish workers movement and thoroughly appraised and analyzed it. Polish experience played an important role in the development of Leninist strategy and tactics for the workers movement, and particularly on the national problem.

Second, in recent years in the PPR Leninism has become the object of frenzied attacks by patent bourgeois and clerical anticommunists receiving support from centers of anticommunist ideological diversion, and also by opportunists, revisionists and native "Eurocommunists" setting Marxism against Leninism and Marx against Lenin and proclaiming a "return to Marx" and a "departure from Lenin."

Third, Leninism has proved to be the only effective teaching making it possible to correctly elucidate the recent past, the present and the future of building socialism in our country.

The PZPR was formed more than 30 years ago as a Marxist-Leninist party. Attitude toward the Leninist legacy in the process of forming the foundations of socialism in Poland was the center of discussions on the ideological and organizational principles of uniting the Polish workers movement. The discussions related to problems of fundamental significance to the fate of socialism in our country: the nature of Marxism-Leninism as the ideology of the workers class and as the theory explaining the state of society at a given moment and giving the revolutionary method of transforming society; the conditions for creatively applying, enriching and developing this method; the essence of socialism as a social system; the general laws and main paths of its formation, which always take place under concrete historical and national conditions; the nature of the united party of the workers class and of the ideological and organizational principles of its activity ensuring the

fulfillment of its vanguard role; and the worldwide, historical significance of the experience of socialist construction in the Soviet Union.

Forty years of socialist construction in Poland have utterly and completely confirmed the truth that the creative application of the Leninist ideological legacy has always been the source of our party's strength and of the PPR's achievements. Any departure from Lenin and from the experience of socialism in the Soviet Union, which has worldwide, historical significance and a shallow, precisely non-Leninist understanding and superficial application of this experience has inevitably become a source of weakness, errors and failures in socialist construction in Poland. The latter have invariably been based on an ignoring of the Leninist interpretation of the essence of socialism and of the universal laws and concrete-historical features and national conditions of its formation. "Events in Poland," said Comrade W. Jaruzelski at the first All-Party Ideological-Theoretical Conference in 1982, "have utterly and completely confirmed the thesis that any departure from the universal principles of Marxism-Leninism together with a lack of a creative, responsible approach to one's own national conditions inevitably leads to distortions and difficulties."

The well-known and frequently cited statement by Lenin that "all nations will come to socialism--this is inevitable--but they will not all come in quite the same way: each will introduce originality to a given form of democracy, to a given variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to a given rate of progress of socialist transformations of various aspects of social life" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 30, p 123) not only contains the idea of the dialectics of the general laws of socialism and the diversity of the conditions under which these laws become manifest, but also the idea of the unevenness of socialism's development.

The formation of socialism is a dynamic and, at the same time, uneven process both on an international and a national scale. Some nations and states approach socialism more rapidly, others more slowly. This happens due to profound historical causes and contemporary objective conditions. They are the consequence of the different levels from which socialist transformations begin, and emanate from the diversity of traditions, degree of socioeconomic development achieved, structure and arrangement of class forces, strength and ideological-political maturity of the workers class and its real ability to fulfill the role of leader in society.

But the uneven development of socialism is primarily caused by subjective factors. They are mainly connected with the Marxist-Leninist party, its degree of theoretical knowledge and political experience and the level and quality of its relations with its own class and with the working people as a whole.

The decisive role of the subjective factor, which predetermines whether the potentials created by revolution will be utilized fully, partially, or let slip to some degree, has been particularly clearly confirmed by the development of Poland in recent decades. The syndrome of subjective strategic and tactical errors permitted in socialist construction particularly in the 1970s (although not only in this period) was the result of many phenomena and

processes. Their common denominator was a departure from Lenin and Leninism, and an ignoring of the logic, laws and stages of building socialism as a social system and a world system, particularly in the transitional period.

First, voluntarism in politics and economics expressed, in particular, in an excessive expansion of the investment front.

Second, a one-sided link between the national economy and the economy of the capitalist countries leading to the appearance of a "noose of debt," on the one hand, and to a weakening of economic relations with the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community on the other.

Third, a loss of prospects of socialist transformation, and particularly an absence of a precise concept of the socialist restructuring of agriculture.

Fourth, a violation of the Leninist principles of party functioning and internal party life.

Fifth, bureaucratic distortion and restriction of socialist democracy.

Sixth, serious omissions in ideological-educational work, particularly among young people, and a superficial--for show--attitude towards ideology and ideological work in the party and in society, which are the result of a voluntarist ignoring of the dialectical connections between ideology, economy and politics.

A departure from Leninism was also constituted by voluntaristically running ahead, proclaiming the building of mature socialism in a situation where its foundations had not yet formed either in the material sphere (agriculture) or in the spiritual, and where Poland was still passing through the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, and also by ignoring real class contradictions and the class struggle. This led to people proclaiming that a moral-political unity of the people really existed, while the activities of the class enemy both within the country and in the international arena were underestimated.

The PZPR leadership at that time forgot Lenin's thesis which had been confirmed in practice: "having won political power, the proletariat does not cease the class struggle but continues it--until class is liquidated--but, of course, in different situations, in different forms and by different means" (op. cit., vol 39, p 15).

Poland's experience shows that jumping stages of socialist construction and proclaiming success where there is none weakens socialism, slows it down and sometimes even leads to regression. This experience also attests to the fact that one cannot with impunity ignore the laws of the class struggle and the real influence and strength of the class enemy.

The weakness and mistakes of the PZPR leadership in the process of building socialism in Poland in the 1970s were skillfully utilized by the class enemy--the forces of internal and external counterrevolution.

Objectively speaking, the forces of anticommunism and counterrevolution were aided by opportunist and capitulating elements. Under the long well-known false slogans of "creative Marxism," "open Marxism" and "a return to Marx," they undermined the Marxist-Leninist nature of the party and ideologically and organizationally disarmed it in the face of concentrated attacks by the internal and external class enemy. Sectarian and dogmatic trends also did not facilitate the struggle against the enemy.

After the offensive of counterrevolution had been stopped, the slogan of a "return to the source," to Leninist ideological legacy became the leading idea in party activity and the main condition of its revival as a Marxist-Leninist party of the workers class.

In an address by the chairman of the Military Council for National Salvation on 13 December 1981, it was stated in particular how essential it was to cleanse the "eternal source of our idea" of distortions, to return to the universal values of socialism and to enrich these values with consideration for national features and traditions. Developing this idea, Comrade W. Jaruzelski said several months later: "...today we must discover Marxism-Leninism afresh, so to speak, by revealing its values and its attractiveness to people of labor and people of science. We must turn it into a powerful weapon for the party in the ideological struggle being waged."

Despite the difficult situation within the PZPR itself and on the political and economic front, as well as great omissions in party ideological work, its healthy Marxist-Leninist worker core experienced a great "ideological hunger." The party needed a reliable ideological compass so that it could revive, win back its lost positions, restore the respect of the workers class and progress forward. ONLY Leninism could serve as such a compass--the living, creatively mastered and applied ideological legacy of Lenin.

Leninism is the Marxism of the era of socialist revolutions and the building of socialism across a considerable area of the globe, the era of its development as a world system, and it is for the PZPR a constantly living and universal scientific theory of the workers movement developing in close connection with social practice.

The Leninist ideological legacy is the result of great theoretical efforts. It provides the present-day generation of communists with a sum of knowledge indicating ways of gaining power and utilizing this power as an instrument for transforming social reality in the spirit of socialism and also revealing the general laws of building socialism.

The works of Lenin are for us a constant example not only of great theoretical creativity and revolutionary activity, but also of efficiency, concreteness and great attention to small detail which grows in importance. From the Leninist ideological legacy there emanates the demand to constantly and thoroughly compare theoretical principles with the concrete, changing arrangement of class forces and socioeconomic and ideological conditions on both a national and international scale, because "to substitute the concrete with the abstract is one of the main sins, one of the most dangerous sins in revolution" (op. cit., vol 34, p 17).

A characteristic feature of Leninism is the connection and unity of theory and practice. Lenin consistently developed and enriched what is most important in Marxism--its revolutionary dialectics, and thereby armed communists with a reliable method of analyzing changing reality.

After the French Marxist-theoretician we can say that "if Marxism represents a science for Lenin, then this is precisely because it makes it possible to thoroughly understand reality, which changes, and history, which never repeats itself" (G. Besse, "Dialectics and Revolution," *STUDIA FILOZOFICZNE*, Warsaw, 1977, No 7-8, p 13). In our turn we can say that if Leninism represents a science for the PZPR--a constantly living, universal and effective science--then this is precisely because it makes it possible to correctly understand and interpret complete Polish reality and the original history of our people and state. Analyzing and evaluating the sociopolitical and ideological reality of contemporary Poland in the Leninist way means examining it dialectically and in all its complexity, while simultaneously singling out what is most important and decisive, what is, to quote Lenin, "the special link." This cannot be done effectively without applying to such concepts and categories as "the transitional period from capitalism to socialism," "class contradictions and the class struggle," "class interests," "the hegemony of the workers class," and "the dictatorship of the proletariat."

The first condition--which is both preliminary and essential--for a "return to Lenin" and for the correct use of his ideological legacy is direct application to his works. Without doing this one cannot learn from Lenin, learn his method of thinking and his method of considering and evaluating social reality. With this aim the PZPR Central Committee adopted a resolution in 1982 on the second edition of the "Complete Collected Works" of V. I. Lenin, on the study of his works within the system of party education and on the propaganda of the Leninist legacy in academic programs on the social sciences in higher education establishments, through the mass information media and within the public education system as a whole. An important role in comprehending the ideas of Lenin and his teaching has been played and continues to be played by the mass publication--in conjunction with the Soviet Progress publishing house--of collections of Lenin's works which are divided into subjects and are particularly topical and necessary to our party, such as, for example, "On the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," "Against Revisionism and Dogmatism," "On Trade Unions," "On the Party," "On Socialist Democracy," and others.

An important role in the propaganda of the Leninist legacy among party members was also played by the preparation of the ideological program declaration "What We Are Striving For, Where We Are Heading," which was adopted at the All-Polish Conference of delegates of the 9th PZPR Congress, and also particularly by the general party discussion of its first draft in spring and summer 1982.

The second condition for a real "return to Lenin" is a creative attitude towards his ideological legacy. We do not adopt the attitude of archive keepers towards Lenin's ideas and his ideological legacy, but treat them as Lenin himself treated the ideological legacy of Marx and Engels. This means

thinking boldly and independently and skillfully applying the Leninist method of "considering objective conditions and changes in them," a method that requires "posing a problem concretely and as applicable to these conditions" (op. cit., vol 35, pp 253-254) and proceeding from the fact that even indisputable historical-philosophical truths become abstract phrases if they are perceived irrespective of the concrete situation.

The third condition for a "return to Lenin" is uncompromising struggle for the purity of theory and against its enemies.

In contemporary Poland Marxism-Leninism does not yet occupy a dominant position in the awareness, convictions and position of the whole of society, in science and in cultural creativity. Hence the necessity not only to broadly disseminate Marxism-Leninism, but also to protect it in the struggle against bourgeois and clerical attacks, which are not only carried out on the waves of anticommunist radio stations hostile to Poland, in underground and illegal publications and secretly smuggled literature from anticommunist emigre centers (such as the Paris-based Kultura), but also in legally published Catholic editions and journals and sometimes even from university departments. Aware of the support and increasingly weighty help of the party and its institutions, advocates of Marxism-Leninism are becoming bolder, more militant and more active in their defense of its teachings. The entire party is placing great hopes in this respect on the recently established PZPR Academy of Social Sciences and on the new journal MARKSISTSKAYA MYSL.

The struggle against opportunist-revisionist and dogmatic-sectarian distortion of Marxism-Leninism has not lost its topicality, although it has taken on new forms.

Contemporary opportunism and revisionism which, as a rule, act in the name of "creative Marxism," its "development" and "bringing up to date," and the aspiration to "keep up with the era and its demands," emasculate its essence and exceed the limits beyond which political apostasy and frequently even overt anticommunism begin. A reflection of this in contemporary Poland (the activities of A. Schaff represent a characteristic, most typical, although not unique example) is the practice of setting the class struggle against class solidarity, the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist democracy against so-called integral democracy and political pluralism and the party of the Leninist type against "freedom of discussion" and "freedom of criticism," which means nothing other than the right to factional activities.

Revisionism in the sphere of theory, which in fact represents depriving Marxism-Leninism of its real essence and originality, goes hand-in-hand with opportunism, that is, with adaptation to existing socioeconomic and political conditions, and with acknowledgment of their inviolable, invariable and, ultimately, desirable nature. A particular expression of this is the concept of a "Polish model of socialism" or "Polish socialism," in accordance with which such phenomena in contemporary Poland as world outlook pluralism, small-scale commodity and small-scale capitalist economy, the market mechanism, and so forth, are considered inviolable and invariable.

In their turn, representatives and advocates of dogmatic-sectarian trends approach Marxism-Leninism with the standard of an archivist, as if it were a closed and completed system. They are deaf to the impulses of the contemporary era and helpless before them, which is reflected in their desire to squeeze new phenomena, processes and problems into old, well-known patterns and molds. In practical activities a natural result of dogmatism is sectarianism, revolutionary cant and arbitrary "correction" of the general party line, which sometimes leads to plain political adventurism.

The PZPR's experience in the struggle against revisionism and dogmatism in the last few years has confirmed the fact that they both have the same basis--lack of understanding of the dialectics of the general laws and national conditions of socialist construction so skillfully developed by Lenin. Revisionism absolutizes mutability, ascribes absolute relativity to social phenomena and processes and exaggerates national originality to the point of nationalism and national megalomania. Dogmatism absolutizes permanency and immutability and fails to note that the general and the universal always have concrete-historical and national forms.

So-called academic Marxism represents another highly dangerous form of distortion of Marxism-Leninism. It regards the teaching of Marx and Lenin as one of many equal scientific theories, in itself and for itself, and not directly connected with the practice of socialist construction. For the representatives of this trend, Marxism is a subject of diverse, essentially speculative interpretations within the framework of its own autonomously interpreted categories. This is contemplative Marxism, at best more or less correctly interpreting the world, but isolated from the social practice of building socialism.

Without struggling for purity of theory and for its authenticity and originality, it is also impossible to fulfill the historic task of winning a predominant position for Marxism-Leninism in the spiritual life of the people. This task can be fulfilled and constitutes an essential, inalienable element and condition of building socialism and forming a socialist awareness in the working people of Poland, as well as a scientific world outlook the foundation of which can only be exclusively Marxist-Leninist ideology. The starting point for fulfilling this historic task is realistic party appraisal, without false idealization, of the state of social awareness and of the positions of Marxism-Leninism in science, particularly in the social sciences and also in culture and artistic creativity.

On the basis of this appraisal, the party has drawn up a long-term program of activity in the sphere of ideology and the formation of socialist social awareness, a program including, in particular, economic, historical, political-legal and atheist education. Party activity is subordinate to implementing this program, which is aimed, for example, at changing academic programs in elementary and secondary schools, restoring and strengthening the positions of Marxism-Leninism in higher schools, perfecting publishing policy and policy relating to the intelligentsia, especially the creative intelligentsia, transforming the system of training and retraining cadres, primarily on the ideological front and so forth.

In accordance with the Leninist interpretation of the process of building socialism and waging ideological struggle, the PZPR takes the stand that in ideology there can be no compromises. Cooperation between nonbelievers and believers for a common cause--building a socialist Poland--and the dialogue emanating from real life between the socialist state and the Catholic Church for the sake of the people's highest interests certainly does not mean that the party has given up defending and deepening the secular nature of the state, struggling against any attempts to clericalize and sacralize social life and confronting the ideology of the Catholic Church and propagandizing a scientific world outlook. Poland's experience has very dramatically confirmed the Leninist thesis that any underestimation of the significance of socialist ideology and any weakening of the struggle for its dominant position in the life of the party, the workers class and the society building socialism inevitably signifies an increase in the influence of bourgeois ideology.

While leading the cause of building socialism in Poland, the PZPR is guided by its universal principles and laws, enriching them with consideration for national features and traditions. Among these laws, which have been confirmed during events in Poland, one should draw attention to the socialization of production means, the existence of the socialist state of the dictatorship of the proletariat as an instrument of the economic, political and spiritual supremacy of the workers class, the worker-peasant alliance as the foundation on which the broadest masses of the working people unite for fulfilling the aims of socialism, the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party as the vanguard of the workers class and proletarian internationalism, which finds concrete expression in the alliance and friendship with the USSR and all countries belonging to the socialist community.

The general principles and laws of building socialism are primarily connected with its essence as a system that is liquidating the exploitation of man by man, and also with the conditions and means of its embodiment, which have been confirmed in practice. This is precisely why it is impossible to determine a reliable path to socialism in one country without conscientiously and comprehensively studying, generalizing and assimilating the experience of other countries, primarily of the first country to pave the way to socialism--the Soviet Union. Utilizing the experience of fraternal states and parties with the aim of avoiding the repetition of mistakes and adopting creative experience that has accumulated over the years and decades thus becomes a universal law of socialist construction and, at the same time, the patriotic duty of the Marxist-Leninist party directing this process.

In accordance with Leninist directions, in its activities the PZPR takes into account that which predetermines the "international significance or historical inevitability of repetition on an international scale" (op. cit., vol 41, p 3) of everything that has fallen to the lot of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. In accordance with Lenin's warning, we do not copy the "Russian model" blindly and mechanically, but, while taking the originality of the historical period into account, we apply "not the letter, but the spirit, sense and lessons" (op. cit., vol 43, p 200) emanating from the experience of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries as a whole, and we also learn to apply the "BASIC principles of communism...in such a way as to CORRECTLY

MODIFY these principles IN CERTAIN DETAILS and correctly adapt them to national and national-state differences" (op. cit., vol 41, p 77).

We also draw the appropriate conclusions from the fact that socialism has become a world system and that the gradual drawing together of the socialist countries is a law of its development. Poland lives and operates within the framework of the socialist community and is one of the links in the world socialist system. Its experience shows that it is impossible to build socialism efficiently if one ignores the law of the internationalization of life within the framework of the socialist community and does not intensify relations with its community in all spheres.

However, socialism is not being built in the abstract, but on a concretely formulated basis, in real society, with its advantages and shortcomings, class and ideological differentiation which is frequently the result of its complicated history and in a definite historical period characterized by the coexistence and struggle of two opposite socioeconomic, political and ideological systems. Poland plays a twofold role in this antagonism: first, by virtue of its belonging to the world of socialism and, second, in view of the special interest shown in it by imperialism, which sets it apart in a special place in its plans for struggle against socialism.

The PZPR approaches the complex of these national features in a dialectical and differentiated way. Those which help to build socialism and are skillfully utilized can become a creative force acting as a spur to social and patriotic activeness. Those which act as a brake on development, burden it, and slow down the rates of progress of socialist transformations are subject to careful study in order to first limit and neutralize their negative influence and then completely liquidate them. This requires special skill of the party in its application of Leninist strategy and tactics.

The party and its strategy and tactics are the axis around which socialist construction revolves. Poland's experience confirms the fact, emphasized by Comrade W. Jaruzelski, that "the leading role of the party is an inviolable principle of socialist construction. The people alone could neither build nor demand socialism without a Marxist-Leninist party. It is not only we who are aware of this. The fact is also known to the enemies of socialism."

Consequently, it is no accident that the contemporary class enemy, like his predecessors 100 years ago--in the period of the conception of the Polish workers movement--struggles against the PZPR under the slogans of the "alienness" of Marxism on Polish soil, its "import," and so forth. The enemy depicts the 40-year history of the PPR in the form of an unbroken chain of defeats and failures, the responsibility for which rests with the party. He stubbornly spreads the opinion that the PZPR does not reflect the aspirations and interests of the Polish workers class and working people, but the interests of an "alien power" and of groups of the apparat estranged from society, that it "does not have its roots in the traditions of Polish culture" and so forth.

In a situation where the party is once again spreading its influence to all spheres of social life and the growth of its leading and guiding role is being

brought in line with the requirements and laws of socialist development, the use of socialism's objective potentials primarily depends on the real ability of the party to resolve problems that arise in the Leninist way. The basic issue is that which Lenin defined as "the education of the party." "In educating the workers party," he wrote, "Marxism educates the vanguard of the proletariat, a vanguard capable of seizing power and LEADING ALL THE PEOPLE toward socialism, directing and organizing the new system and acting as the mentor and leader of all working people and all who are exploited, in the cause of building their social life without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie" (op. cit., vol 33, p 26). All PZPR activity since its 9th Congress, and especially since 13 December 1981, has served the "education of the party" as the vanguard of socialist construction. Two aspects have been established and retained in this sphere.

The first aspect is that of establishing the Leninist principles of inner party life. This is served by the principles on which elections are based and which extend the influence of rank-and-file party members and organizations on leading organs at all levels; the system of inner party consultations which ensures communists' influence on the formation of programs of party activity and on the decisions of its leading organs; the new style of work of the Central Committee and its links with primary organizations via the system of constant consultations; the system introduced throughout the whole of the PZPR--in accordance with a decision of the 9th Central Committee Plenum--of considering the proposals of party members, organizations and institutions, the system of examining these proposals, and also supervision and control over their fulfillment; and the strengthening of discipline and increasing of efficiency, which guarantees the entire party the possibility of speaking "the same language" and the ability to operate "as a united front."

The second aspect is that of strengthening the worker nature of the PZPR, because restoring and strengthening the faith of the workers class in the party is a "special link" and key to resolving the problems facing us. Our experience shows that this is possible only when the party expresses the interests of this class in its determination of the strategic aims of socioeconomic development and their fulfillment and also when, on the other hand, this class realizes through its own everyday experience that the party is necessary to it because it reflects its interests, defends them and fulfills the principles of socialism in daily life.

Strengthening the worker nature of the PZPR and restoring the faith of the workers class in the party is helped, in particular, by developing the mechanisms of socialist democracy which make it possible for the workers class to play a leading role in society and in the state--for example, by participating in the people's councils, trade unions, organs of self-management and within the system of public consultations and control. The practice of workers participating directly in the working out of programs and decisions concerning socioeconomic and political matters is developing and being consolidated. Examples of this are the All-Polish Conference of the Workers Aktiv in 1983, meetings between party and government leaders and trade union figures, consultations on the situation concerning elections to the people's soviets, on price changes, on the main aspects of the plan for economic development in 1984 and so forth. This aim has also been served by

the formation of Worker-Peasant Inspection. Just as Lenin once did, the PZPR connects its formation and activities with "the general plan of our work our policies, our tactics and our strategy" (op. cit., vol 45, p 405).

Striving to consolidate the role of the workers class as the real leader in society, the PZPR tries, without false idealization, to determine the level of its class awareness, its real needs and its thoughts and aspirations, in order to shape them correctly, in the socialist spirit.

Without winning the faith of the workers class and consolidating its position as master of the socialist state, it is impossible to strengthen the class foundation of this state--the worker--peasant alliance. Lenin's words that one must "learn to build socialism in practice so that EVERY peasant can participate in this building process" (op. cit., vol 45, p 370) serve as a motto for PZPR activity in this sphere. To this end one must, in particular, put an end to fruitless fantasizing, discard utopian projects that cannot be fulfilled in the immediate future and renounce revolutionary cant.

In its policy with regard to the peasantry, the countryside and agriculture, the party cannot abstract itself from peasant experience, from the zigzags which have occurred in agrarian policy in the past decades and from the fact that winning the faith of the working peasant masses is the prime and chief condition of building socialism in rural areas and restructuring agriculture on its basis. "Recasting, reeducating," to quote Lenin, the millions of peasants who are small-scale commodity producers is very difficult. As Lenin pointed out and experience has confirmed, this path and this work is very long and slow (op. cit., vol 41, p 27). They require us to take into account not only the peasant's experience, but also his psychology, awareness, convictions and positions.

When determining the prospects of the socialist transformation of the Polish countryside and the socialist restructuring of agriculture, the PZPR closely connects them with providing the people with foodstuffs through their own resources and also with gradually but consistently liquidating the differences between the standard of living in the countryside and in the cities in terms of leisure conditions and access to education and culture.

The PZPR connects the prospects for the socialist restructuring of agriculture with the Leninist principle of total volition and with consideration of the will and interest of the peasants themselves, convinced that the socialization of agricultural production is advantageous from an economic, social and cultural point of view. The socialist sector must be a model for emulation and the vanguard of progressive changes in the Polish countryside.

The PZPR operates in the direction of creating real, and not simply nominal, "bridgeheads of socialism" in rural areas and contributes to strengthening and perfecting them so that they serve as an example of zealous economic operations, develop on healthy economic and social principles, are models of a high standard of agriculture, sufficiency [dostatka], and civilization, and become a magnet drawing others toward the socialist method of economic operations.

The PZPR regards strengthening the role of the workers class in society and consolidating the worker-peasant alliance as the necessary basis for forming a broad national front, the organizational-political expression of which is the Patriotic Movement of National Rebirth in contemporary Poland.

The formation of this movement is based on Lenin's idea, applied to Poland's conditions and especially to its experience in recent years, that socialism cannot be built "by the hands of revolutionaries alone...Without an alliance with noncommunists in the most diverse spheres of activity, there can be no talk of any successful communist construction" (op. cit., vol 45, p 23). Acting in accordance with the Leninist motto: "The revolutionary proletariat must know whom to suppress and with whom--and when and how--to conclude agreement" (op. cit., vol 37, p 19). The PZPR has developed a strategy of struggle and agreement. The consistent implementation of this strategy makes it possible to realize three aims:

first, to expose the political enemy and his antisocialist and antinational essence;

second, to attract the broad masses, who partly still do not trust the party and the people's power and who stand to one side to "merge" with them, and to educate them in the socialist spirit, but without the party losing its political leadership of them in this respect;

third, to make political compromises with possible allies, but not at the cost of principled concessions or renouncing political and ideological principles.

While "returning to Lenin" and using and enriching his legacy in the concrete conditions of its country, the PZPR does not lose sight of its long-term aim. This means that such actions and only such actions are taken which hasten and facilitate the triumph of socialism and which simultaneously make it possible for the party to retain its constant link with the workers class and the popular masses.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

CSO: 1802/10

AT THE HEAD OF THE VICTORIOUS PEOPLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 85 (signed to press 27 Feb 85) pp 63-74

[Article by Army General A. Yepishev, chief of the Main Political Administration of the Soviet Army and Navy]

[Text] The Soviet people, their friends and allies and the progressive people on earth are preparing to mark solemnly the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascist Germany. The time which separates us from the historical advance of the victorious May 1945 allows us to see and to evaluate with increasing clarity the greatness of the exploit performed by our country in the name of socialism, peace and progress. "By inflicting a crushing defeat on the enemy," the CPSU Central Committee decree, "On the 40th Anniversary of the Victory of the Soviet People in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945" emphasizes, "the Soviet people and their armed forces, headed by the communist party, defended the freedom and independence of the socialist homeland and the cause of the October Revolution. They made a decisive contribution to the victory over fascist Germany and its allies, the liberation of the peoples of Europe from fascist slavery and the salvation of world civilization. They honorably fulfilled their patriotic and international duty. This is their greatest contribution to humankind."

Communist party leadership was the decisive source of our great victory. It was precisely the party which organized, rallied and inspired the Soviet people, channeling their will power, energy and action toward a single goal. The party's Central Committee was the political headquarters which managed the war: the combat operations of army and navy and the spiritual life of the country which had become one large military camp. It was the center where a wise and far-sighted foreign policy was formulated in a Leninist way.

During the times of terrible danger threatening the country, Lenin's party became a fighting party. The communists were in the most difficult and decisive sectors of the struggle against the enemy. With their personal example and impassionate party words they inspired and led the Soviet people to victory.

In the duel with fascist Germany, which embodied the most reactionary forces of imperialism, our country proved the insurmountable viability of socialism and its unquestionable advantages over the capitalist system. The objective

possibilities of a successful struggle against the aggressor were inherent in the very nature of the new social and governmental system. However, in themselves, the objective possibilities of victory do not mean its inevitability. The conversion of a possibility into reality, particularly in such a complex phenomenon as war, is achieved through the interaction of a variety of factors which clearly influence the development of the armed struggle and its overall outcome. History is familiar with many examples in which governments which, while seemingly having everything necessary to defeat the enemy, lost real possibilities of victory and let their armies be defeated.

The objective possibilities of defeating the enemy are achieved when the ruling party, the government and the high military command run the war.

In the very first days of Hitlerite aggression, not only the immediate tasks in organizing a resistance to the enemy were formulated, but the party's strategic concepts for the duration of the war as well. The program of the struggle against the enemy was profoundly scientific and entirely based on the Leninist theory of the defense of the socialist fatherland. Its characteristic feature was true realism and social optimism and ineradicable faith in the strength of the people and final victory. The engraved words of the party slogan "Our Cause Is Just. The Enemy Will Be Defeated. Victory Will Be Ours" expressed the spiritual mood of the Soviet people for the entire 1,418 days and nights of war.

The party took fully into consideration the fact that the Soviet state and the armed forces were facing a terrible and treacherous enemy. Fascist Germany, which was the strike force of the capitalist world militarily, had captured the material resources of virtually all Western European countries. The Hitlerite leaders were able to poison with the toxin of nationalism and racism the broad population masses in their country and to use them in the unjust war against socialism.

In creatively applying Lenin's theory of contemporary wars, the communist party provided an active and exhaustive characterization of the war which had broken out. "The purpose of the attack," stated the 29 June 1941 VKP(b) Central Committee and USSR Sovnarkom directive, "is the destruction of the Soviet system, the seizure of Soviet land, the enslavement of the peoples of the Soviet Union, the plunder of our country...and the restoration of the power of landowners and capitalists."

The party made no secret of the fact that the war had most clearly raised the question of the life or death of the Soviet state and of whether or not the peoples of the Soviet Union would be free or enslaved. The truth of the aggression committed by fascist Germany as a war of aggression, plunder and unfairness was heard throughout the world. This exposed the lies of Goebbels' propaganda of the "preventive" nature of the attack on the Soviet Union, a lie which to this day, 40 years later, is repeated by the Western falsifiers of history.

In expressing this historical truth, the party emphasized that for the Soviet Union this was a just war of liberation, a patriotic war. In terms of

sociopolitical content, it was an uncompromising clash between socialism and the assault detachment of imperialism and the most sinister forces of international reaction.

From the very beginning of the war, the communist party considered it as organically related to the liberation struggle of the enslaved peoples and countries in Europe. The USSR was the initiator of the establishment of a unified front of the struggle against fascism and of an anti-Hitlerite coalition. The Soviet Union did not only struggle for its independence and sovereignty but openly stated that the purpose of its struggle was to help all the peoples of Europe moaning under the fascist yoke. This substantiated the great liberating mission of the Soviet people and their armed forces. It was based on the political and class content of the war imposed upon us and the uncompromising fight against fascism.

In subordinating the entire internal life of the country and its entire policy and practical activities to the interests of the war, the party made skillful use of the great advantages of the socialist economy and the Soviet social and government system, the powerful force of Marxism-Leninism and the unquestionable superiority of our military organization, focusing them entirely on achieving victory. Practical proof was offered on how to use the advantages of the new social system and the objective prerequisites and subjective factors in harnessing the material and spiritual resources of the country for the defeat of the treacherous enemy. Lenin's stipulation that in order to wage war in defense of socialism "all popular forces must become involved. The entire country must turn into a revolutionary camp" and that "everything must be subordinated to the interests of the war" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 37, p 383; vol 41, p 117) was implemented.

The involvement of huge masses of troops, combat materiel and weapons in the war led to the tremendous scale of combat operations and required the formulation and resolution of new strategic problems. This was clearly taken into consideration during the war in the exercise of economic and social policy.

The party's economic policy set the task of converting the national economy to a military track and to eliminating the temporary advantages enjoyed by the enemy in terms of quantity and, in some items, quality of weaponry and military hardware. The final objective was to achieve total military-economic superiority over the enemy.

In resolving these problems, our state relied on the historical accomplishments of the people in laying the material and technical foundations for socialism. The war proved the entire wisdom and far-sightedness of the party's activities and its concern for the establishment of new industrial sectors and the development of the areas along the Volga, and in the Urals, Siberia, Central Asia and Kazakhstan. In the first 3 years of the 3rd Five-Year Plan alone, industry in these areas had increased its output by a factor of 1.5. Under most difficult conditions, this gave our economy unparalleled stability and endurance and ensured the security of its strategic rear guard.

Before the war, the Soviet people had developed on a high-level technical basis an aviation, tank and artillery industry and navy construction. These problems had been in the center of attention of party and soviet bodies and scientific, design and production collectives. The task of ensuring the development and series production of the latest models of aircraft, tanks and artillery, technologically equal to a probable enemy, had been set before the war.

In particular, the T-34 tank was developed at the Plant imeni Comintern in Kharkov. At that time, the author of this article was VKP(b) Central Committee party organizer at that enterprise and, subsequently, first secretary of the Kominternovskiy party raykom and first secretary of the Kharkov obkom and gorkom of the Ukrainian CP(b).

The T-34 was designed by M. I. Koshkin, A. A. Morozov, M. A. Kucherenko and other talented designers. Many were the difficulties they had to overcome before the first prototype was produced. This was an essentially new design, unlike any other domestic or foreign tank. Designers, engineers, technicians and workers followed untrodden paths, displaying creativity, technical daring and great civic courage in seeking optimal solutions. Particularly great attention was needed in resolving problems related to the development, assembling and installing the V-2 motor. The plant party organization threw its support behind the idea formulated by T. P. Chupakhin, Ya. Ye. Vikhman, M. P. Poddubnyy and others, who called for developing a tank diesel engine which would allow the tank to improve its speed, fuel consumption and operational safety.

The party's Central Committee and Soviet government paid close attention to the work of the tank builders. We were given all the necessary assistance but also asked to master the mass production of this new battle machine faster. We were pressed! A memorable conference was summoned by the party obkom for the plant management on 22 May 1941 (a month before the outbreak of the war) on the question of fulfilling the production program. V. A. Malyshev, USSR Sovnarkom deputy chairman, who was present, gave a high rating to the contribution of the people of Kharkov to strengthening the defense power of the country and emphasized that should war break out "we shall not only defend ourselves but, if necessary, advance.... We must have military equipment of a standard higher than that of the capitalists.... The pace and time of mastery must be the shortest possible."

History did not give us sufficient time for the production of the new combat materiel in the necessary amounts. What was of extreme importance, however, was also the fact that industry had mastered such production.

The conversion of the national economy to a military track had to take place under the extremely adverse circumstances of the initial period of the war, when the most important economic areas in the Western part of the country were lost. An evacuation of production forces deep within the country, unparalleled in world practice, had to take place and war production organized there within the shortest possible time.

The party's leadership of the economy was strengthened in order to resolve this complex problem which was to determine the outcome of the war. The important sectors of economic work were headed by Central Committee Politburo members and candidate members and by members and candidate members of the VKP(b) Central Committee.

The party committees in the large industrial centers in the country, where war production was increased significantly, set up departments in charge of the production of tanks, aircraft, ammunition, mortars and armaments.

All of this significantly accelerated the conversion of the eastern parts of the country into a powerful arsenal for victory. The reorganization of the national economy was completed by the middle of 1942. The lost war production capacities were considerably exceeded. The war industry began to supply the front with everything necessary, increasingly and rhythmically. The kolkhoz system proved its tremendous viability. The heroic toil of women, old people and adolescents ensured the country with food and raw materials. The economic victory in the war was secured.

Despite a prewar industrial base which was smaller than that of Germany, for which the industry of the conquered countries worked, by a factor of 1.5-2, during the war the Soviet Union produced combat materiel nearly double that produced by fascist Germany.

All of this refutes bourgeois propaganda claims that our victory was assured by allied lend-lease. For example, U.S. supplies accounted for some 2 percent of antiaircraft artillery, up to 13 percent of aircraft and 7 percent of tanks, compared to domestic output.

The party's social policy during the war years was aimed at comprehensively strengthening the unity and cohesion of Soviet society and the unbreakable alliance among workers, peasants and intelligentsia, strengthening the friendship among the peoples of the USSR, mobilizing all forces to repel the enemy and enhancing the social responsibility of the people, discipline and organization.

"War," K. Marx wrote, "subjects a nation to a trial.... In the same way that mummies instantly fall apart when exposed to the atmosphere, war passes a final sentence on social institutions which have lost their viability" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 11, p 551).

The Soviet social and governmental system honorably withstood the trials of the war. They proved the unparalleled viability of all parts of the Soviet political system and its social institutions.

In the war years, the party's social policy was entirely based on the revolutionary changes which had taken place in our society during the building of socialism. The elimination of private ownership and of the exploitation of man by man led to the elimination of class antagonisms. The leading role of the working class increased steadily and its alliance with the kolkhoz peasantry and the new socialist intelligentsia strengthened.

Under the Soviet system, millions and millions of people saw with their own eyes that this was a truly people's system. No similar example could be found in history in which the interests of the ruling party, the state and the people coincided to the extent reached during the Great Patriotic War.

The war against the German-fascist aggressors became nationwide.

The party organizations headed the struggle of the patriots in territory temporarily occupied by the enemy. Special staffs were set up to give military leadership to the partisan movement.

The partisan movement grew into a formidable combat force. During the war the partisans disabled some 1 million enemy soldiers and officers, routed hundreds of garrisons and derailed thousands of enemy trains.

The combat operations of the partisans were usually coordinated with Red Army operations.

It would be difficult to overestimate the role which partisans and clandestine workers played in disorganizing the fascist "New Order," engaging in propaganda work and defeating occupation measures.

The Hitlerite reliance on the outbreak of discord among nations and weakening the Soviet multinational state failed during the war. All nations and nationalities in our country rallied even more closely around the great Russian people and, under the leadership of the communist party, joined in a battle to death against the enemy. Their friendship and unity became a powerful factor of our victory. Regardless of their nationality, the troops knew that they were defending their homeland, their socialist fatherland.

The predatory attack of the fascists triggered a tremendous patriotic upsurge in the Soviet people, who were fully resolved to defend the honor and independence of their homeland. Life itself confirmed the accuracy of Lenin's conclusion that "a people the majority of whom were workers and peasants learned, felt and saw that they were defending their own Soviet system--the system of the working people--will never be defeated...." (op. cit., vol 38, p 315).

Powerful Soviet patriotism became the strongest force which ensured moral and political superiority over the enemy and one of the decisive factors of victory. The power of Soviet patriotism was clearly manifested in the exploits of the troops at the front and the nationwide movement for financial and material aid to the front. More than 2,500 combat aircraft, several thousand tanks and artillery guns, more than 20 submarines and navy launches and a great deal of other combat equipment and armaments were built and given to the troops with funds contributed by the population. Subscription to state war loans covered 15 percent of all military expenditures of the Soviet Union.

The party's work in helping the wounded and disabled was of tremendous social and military importance. The entire health care system was reorganized. This work yielded outstanding results: more than 72 percent of wounded Soviet troops were returned to the front. The Soviet people spared nothing to

preserve the life and health of the defenders of the homeland. Under the most difficult conditions of the war, although short of food and sleep, more than 5.5 million Soviet citizens donated their blood for transfusion to wounded and sick troops and commanders.

In the social area, the party took into consideration the changes which were taking place in the structure of classes and social strata and the demographic and age changes in the population's structure and the heavy losses at the front. Particular attention was paid to work among women and adolescents. The families of slain front-line soldiers and their children were targets of particular concern by party and state bodies. Even under wartime conditions the growing generations were given the opportunity to develop spiritually and physically.

During the war years, the party's ideological work was aimed at explaining the just objectives and liberating nature of the Great Patriotic War, exposing the reactionary and savage nature of fascism and fascist ideology and predatory politics, and mobilizing the spiritual forces of the people for the defeat of the enemy. The activities of all means of ideological influence contributed to the defense of the homeland: the press, radio, motion pictures and news agencies, literature, the arts and cultural and educational institutions. The trade unions, the Komsomol and the defense and other public organizations of working people engaged in extensive educational work. The content of all ideological activities at the front and in the rear was entirely subordinate to the tasks of the war. It was closely related to life and was distinguished by its specific nature, purposefulness, militant and aggressive spirit and truthfulness.

At the beginning of the war, the party considered the struggle against carelessness and tolerance a key task in harnessing the spiritual forces of the people. The patriotic and international upbringing of our people were intensified. Extensive propaganda promoted the advantages of the socialist system and showed the greatness of the victories which our country had won in one quarter of a century after the October Revolution.

Unabated attention was paid to problems of Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism. The journal BOL'SHEVIK alone dedicated to such topics 75 of 86 documents, 47 of 50 editorials and editorial articles, 138 of 175 articles by different authors and 44 of 47 international surveys, between 1942 and 1944.

In organizing international upbringing, the party took into consideration the fact that millions of people had moved in the course of the war. Members of different nationalities unfamiliar with the language and customs of the native population, found themselves in many union republics. The party's Central Committee ascribed great importance to militant political agitation, informing the people of the situation at the fronts and organizing correspondence between working people in republics, krais, oblasts and production collectives and front-line troops. Leading party, soviet and military personnel addressed numerous mass meetings and rallies. Letters-instructions to troops from their native areas were accepted and great patriotic movements were started.

The works of the Marxist-Leninist classics on problems of war and peace and pamphlets and books on the Great Patriotic War, the heroism of the Soviet people at the front and in the rear and the revolutionary, labor and combat traditions of the Soviet people were published in mass petitions.

Men of literature and the arts considered it their most responsible and important task to depict the greatness of events, trigger profound and emotional thoughts about the homeland and instill even greater hatred for the enemy. Works created on the fresh tracks of events, dedicated to the great victory at Moscow, the heroic struggle for Lenin's city and the legendary epic of Stalingrad were of tremendous help in mobilizing the people against fascism.

The great vital power of Marxist-Leninist ideas and the party's purposeful work among the masses laid the foundations for the outstanding ideological and moral-political victory over fascism. The high patriotic feeling and invincible moral spirit of the people and the armed forces made it possible to surmount the tremendous wartime difficulties and to maintain and increase ideological and political superiority over the enemy.

The increased political consciousness of the Soviet people was a source of firmness and courage displayed by the soldiers of the front and the partisans and clandestine workers behind enemy lines. This was clearly confirmed by the mass heroism shown by the defenders of the socialist fatherland, which became the norm of behavior of the Soviet people at the front and in the rear.

During the war, battle orders and medals were awarded to more than 7 million troops. The title Hero of the Soviet Union was awarded to 11,500 people.

Mass labor heroism in the rear developed into a movement for outstripping plan norms (by 200, 500 or 1,000 percent) and competition among Komsomol-youth brigades under the slogan "At Work As in Combat."

During the war years, the party tirelessly exposed the human-hating ideology of fascism, racism and obscurantism, thus undermining the moral and political foundations of enemy military power. The moral spirit of enemy troops dropped and the discontent of the German population with the Nazi regime increased under the influence of the victories won by our troops at the fronts and Soviet propaganda. The collapse of Hitlerite Germany meant the collapse and total bankruptcy of fascist ideology.

During the war the party's foreign policy was aimed at creating and strengthening the anti-Hitlerite coalition, the international isolation of fascist Germany, the unification of antifascist forces and the creation of favorable foreign policy conditions for waging the war. The prewar consistent Leninist peace-loving foreign policy of the communist party and Soviet state significantly contributed to the successful solution of these vitally important problems.

The nature of World War II radically changed after the USSR entered the war against Germany. The most far-sighted Western politicians saw and realized that Germany and its allies could not be defeated without the decisive role of

the Soviet Union. All of this objectively contributed to our country becoming the center of the anti-Hitlerite coalition. The establishment of the latter was an outstanding victory of the foreign policy course of the communist party and Soviet state. The very fact that countries with different social systems, pursuing different political, economic and military objectives in the war had united, was of tremendous historical significance. To this day the USSR actively encourages the use of the rich experience of cooperation among countries in the anti-Hitlerite coalition and all antifascist forces in the struggle against the arms race and the threat of nuclear war.

The flexible and perspicacious foreign policy of the Soviet state earned our people and its armed forces, heroically fighting fascism, a growing reputation and powerful support. The 40 years which have passed since the end of the war and the contemporary political realities in Europe clearly prove that the far-sightedness of our foreign policy ensured the solution of problems of the postwar structure on a historically just basis.

Voices demanding a revision of the Yalta decisions are now heard in the upper power echelons in the United States. This has become a kind of dope for the West German revanchists, for those who consider the "German problem" open. The results of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences and the struggle waged by the USSR and the other socialist countries for their systematic implementation became the foundations for peace in Europe. No one has the right to change them.

The party's military policy was directed toward resolving the most difficult problems of political and strategic leadership of the armed forces, developing and strengthening the army and navy in the course of the armed struggle and providing comprehensive support for their combat operations. The party proceeded from the fact that the armed struggle at the fronts of the Great Patriotic War had become a synthesizing factor in realizing the economic, sociopolitical, scientific and technical and spiritual potential of the country and its foreign policy successes. From the very start of the war and to its very end, the main link in the party's entire policy was defeating the fascist Wehrmacht. The party's war policy assumed decisive significance for the destiny of our homeland and the fate of socialism. All party organizational and ideological activities were subordinated to its implementation.

Unity between words and actions and tireless struggle for the implementation of decisions were manifested with particular emphasis during the war. In its leadership of the war the party proceeded from the fact that the formulation of an accurate policy and giving millions of people a program for action were matters of tremendous importance. At the same time, it acted as the creative organizer of the practical implementation of its political line.

The war raised particular requirements concerning the means and methods of party work. Exigency toward party members and their responsibility for the state of affairs in their sectors and for the strict and efficient implementation of the resolutions of superior party bodies were enhanced significantly. All of this resulted in the considerable strengthening of party discipline.

Extraordinary management bodies and new units of the administrative apparatus were created during the war years, with a view to ensuring unity of political and military leadership of the country and the armed forces. The Supreme Command Headquarters of the Armed Forces of the USSR, subsequently renamed Supreme Command Headquarters, was created on 23 June 1941 by decision of the VKP(b) Central Committee and USSR Sovnarkom. It assumed direct control of combat operations of the army, navy, partisan forces and reserves.

The State Committee for Defense was created by decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, VKP(b) Central Committee and USSR Sovnarkom, dated 30 June. It included Politburo members and candidate members. J. V. Stalin was made its chairman. The full power was concentrated in the hands of this new body, which could unite the efforts of the front and the rear, make operative decisions and ensure their strict implementation.

The efficiently coordinated country management system, which was established during the first months of the war and was welded by a single will and iron discipline, was able to withstand all trials and to prove its high efficiency.

Under contemporary conditions, when the international situation has become drastically aggravated by the fault of reactionary imperialist circles, and military affairs have become much more complex, the principle of unity of political and strategic leadership in defending the socialist fatherland is particularly important. The coordination of activities of the party, state and military apparatus, with the leading role of the party's Central Committee, makes it possible to do everything necessary reliably to ensure the safety of the homeland and socialism.

The concentration of forces in the decisive sectors in the struggle against the enemy and intensified party-political work among the soldiers' masses were characteristic of the party's military-organizational activities during the war. Energetic steps were taken to strengthen military councils, political bodies and political personnel. During the first 6 months of the war some 8,800 leading party workers joined the armed forces, reaching nearly 14,000 during the war years. The reorganization of administrations and departments for political propaganda into political administrations and departments contributed to upgrading the prestige and influence of political organs. A. S. Shcherbakov, Politburo candidate member and VKP(b) Central Committee secretary, assumed the head of the Main Political Administration of the Red Army as in the summer of 1942.

The difficult situation which prevailed during the initial periods of the war required the use of the institution of military commissars in the armed forces. In no way did this step mean political distrust of commanders. It was not aimed at belittling one-man command. Alongside the commanders, the commissars assumed full responsibility for the implementation of combat assignments of the unit or formation; they strengthened the political-moral condition of the personnel, discipline and organization. Commissars and political organizers deserve tremendous credit for strengthening the army's combat capability during the most difficult period of the war and enhancing the political and combat maturity of command cadres. Commanders gained combat

experience in the heavy battles and greatly matured politically and militarily. For that reason, total one-man command was resumed as of October 1942. This was done at one of the most important, stressed and crucial periods of the battle for Stalingrad, proving the inflexible confidence in our victory, the tremendous trust shown by the party and the people in officer cadres and the enhancement of their role and responsibility for the outcome of the war.

The redistribution of party forces took place by decision of the Central Committee, with a view to strengthening the party's leading role in the armed forces. By the end of 1941, the army and navy numbered more than 1.2 million party members or more than double the number on the eve of the war. The number of party organizations doubled as well.

Subsequently, the party concentrated more than one-half of its membership in the armed forces. As many as two-thirds of them were in the active army. The party members influenced the people, embodying through words and actions the party's authority and its will and resolve to win, in each primary unit of the organizational structure of the troops.

Many thousands of party members, who fought in the front ranks and in the most important and dangerous sectors, died bravely. The flow of party members coming from civilian organizations could not ensure the necessary reinforcement of army and navy party organizations with the necessary number of members. The prewar party enrollment procedure was no longer consistent with the need for a systematic growth of party ranks. The party resolved this problem innovatively. The main emphasis was concentrated on accepting distinguished soldiers in the party. The VKP(b) Central Committee amended and facilitated the conditions for their enrollment. However, this did mean in the least any lowering of requirements; what was changed was rather the nature of procedures. The qualities of a person were manifested significantly faster and more fully at war than in peacetime. Daring and firmness in battle demanded the supreme stress of spiritual and physical efforts and became the most important criterion of party-mindedness. The desire of the troops to link their destinies with the party during the most difficult and responsible period in the life of the people was an indicator of the party's tremendous prestige among the masses and the readiness of the people to undergo any sacrifices for the sake of the common cause.

The mass enrollment of new members sparked the question of the ideological tempering and political education of the young party members. Under combat conditions, particular attention was paid to individual forms of work. Problems of party history and international and domestic policy were discussed in the intervals between battles.

The party's influence on all aspects of the combat activities of the troops had to be intensified as the volume and complexity of the problems of leading the armed struggle increased. Reality proved that the existing structure of party and Komsomol organizations and the system of elective secretaries were not entirely consistent with the increased requirements for party political work.

On 24 May 1943 the VKP(b) Central Committee passed a decree on reorganizing the structure of party and Komsomol organizations in the Red Army and intensifying the role of the front, army and division press. The document stipulated that these steps should result in "the energizing of party work, the growth of the party aktiv and the enhancement of the role of party and Komsomol organizations in the Red Army." The purpose of the reorganization was to bring the party's leadership closer to the battalion-company level and to give it continuity and efficiency. The main burden of educating the people now lay on the shoulders of company, division and battalion organizations. The regimental party bureau was assigned the functions of party committee and a system of appointed party organizers of regiments, battalions and companies was established. This made it possible quickly to replace party managers who had become war casualties. The Komsomol organizations were restructured similarly.

Problems of reinforcing the active army with personnel and training officer cadres were among the most important in leading the armed forces during the war. The scale of such activities is confirmed by the following data: during the war more than 20 million people were drafted in the army and navy and some 2 million officers were trained. In work with military cadres, developing communist idea-mindedness and responsibility for combat assignments, extensive study of military affairs and successful mastery of combat experience were the main features.

At each different stage of the war the party set for the armed forces corresponding political targets and strategic assignments which determined the content of their combat activities. The depth of scientific forecasting, strict objectivity in the assessment of forces and the daring and flexibility of Soviet operative-tactical and strategic thinking ensured the successful implementation of operation on an unparalleled historical scale.

During the first, most difficult and dramatic period of the war, our army and navy held back the pressure of superior enemy forces, thus ensuring conditions for the mobilization of the forces and means of the entire country to repel the enemy. The defeat of the Germans at Moscow dispersed the myth of the invincibility of the fascist army and definitively buried Hitler's "lightning war" plan. The battle and victory at Stalingrad marked the beginning of a radical turn not only in the Great Patriotic War but in World War II as a whole. The victory at Kursk and the battle for the Dnepr completed this turn and took Germany to the brink of a military-political catastrophe. Soviet territory was totally cleared of the enemy in 1944 as a result of the powerful strikes dealt along the entire length of the Soviet-German front, and the war moved beyond the borders of our homeland.

At the concluding stage in the war, in the course of the definitive routing of the enemy, the Soviet armed forces honorably fulfilled their internationalist liberating mission.

Loyal to its duty as an ally, in August 1945 the USSR entered the war in the Far East and within an extremely short time routed the Kwantung army, the main striking force of imperialist Japan.

The Soviet Union and its armed forces played a decisive role in the victorious outcome of World War II, in which the Soviet-German front was the main one. It was precisely here that the German fascist military machine was crushed. The German-fascist army suffered more than 72 percent of its total casualties in combats and battles against the Red Army. The bulk of the enemy's military ordnance as well was destroyed on the Soviet-German front--up to 75 percent of the total losses in tanks and assault artillery guns, more than 75 percent of all aviation losses and 74 percent of total losses of artillery weapons.

However hard the imperialist ideologues and politicians are trying to belittle the role which the Soviet armed forces played in the defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism today, they will be unable to conceal the great truth of history.

The war imposed upon the Soviet people had sociopolitical consequences unforeseen by imperialism. Despite the hopes of international reaction, the USSR came out of the war even stronger and with an immeasurably increased international reputation. Under the leadership of the CPSU, within the shortest possible time the victorious people healed the wounds inflicted by the war and increased even further the country's material and spiritual resources.

The USSR's entry into the stage of developed socialism was the end result of its constructive activities.

Today the constructive tasks of the Soviet people must be resolved in the difficult circumstances of a drastic increase of the threat of war coming from imperialism. During the entire postwar era, the U.S. and NATO reactionary circles have made persistent attempts to "throw back," "contain" or "remove" communism. Throughout that time, metaphorically speaking, they kept us in their sights with their finger on the trigger. In recent years, a "crusade" was openly proclaimed in Washington, aimed at destroyed socialism as a sociopolitical system.

The adventuristic warmongering course set by the United States and NATO is countered by the Soviet Union with a policy of consistent love of peace, combined with high-level vigilance and tireless attention paid to strengthening its defense potential. "The Soviet people," Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, stressed in his 22 February 1985 electoral speech, "may be confident that the party and the state have done and will do everything necessary for our armed forces to be able reliably to protect the peaceful life of the people and for the defense capability of the country always to remain on the necessary level." The new Soviet initiative relative to the talks between the USSR and the United States on the entire set of problems of preventing the militarization of space and limiting and reducing nuclear armaments--strategic and medium-range--is a convincing confirmation of our peaceableness.

The Soviet Union proclaimed its readiness to engage in talks seriously and purposefully, on the basis of the strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security.

In the current difficult military-political situation, the Soviet armed forces must maintain a constant high combat readiness, which will guarantee the immediate rebuff of any aggressor. The army and navy are always ready to carry out this assignment.

Today the children and grandchildren of those who defeated the enemy on the battlefields of the Great Patriotic War are in the battle ranks. They are worthily continuing the great combat traditions of the front veterans. This is clearly manifested in the military exploits of the troops which are fulfilling their international duty in Afghanistan, the vigilant combat watch in units and ships, the labor exploit of railroad troops building the BAM [Baykal-Amur Mainline] and everyday military life.

In our country defense of the fatherland is a matter for the entire nation. The party has always considered the military-patriotic upbringing of the population, the young people in particular, an important part of its work. In this noble project it relies on the trade unions, the Komsomol, DOSAAF and the creative and other public organizations. Our great veterans are actively participating in the upbringing of the young.

The Soviet people are welcoming the 40th anniversary of the Great Victory under circumstances of active preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress. At its 27th Congress, the party will adopt a new draft of the CPSU program and formulate the strategy and tactics for the years to come.

In days of peaceful toil, as in the terrible wartime, the Soviet people see the leadership of the communist party as the main source of their successes and victories. Under the wise leadership of Lenin's party, the working people in the land of the soviets will achieve new successes in perfecting developed socialism and multiply the results of the universal historical victory in the Great Patriotic War.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/10

'AND OUR GIRL CAME IN A MILITARY GREATCOAT...."

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 85 (signed to press 27 Feb 85) pp 75-80

[Article by Yuliya Drunina]

[Text] To the women of my generation, Komsomol members during the terrible 1940s, adult life is sharply divided into two uneven parts: 4 endless years of war followed by 40 (fully 40!) years which seem to have slipped by imperceptibly....

We know that the wind puts out the weak flame but fans the strong. The fierce stormy wind of time has been unable to extinguish the fires of the Great Patriotic War in the hearts and memories of frontline veterans.

With every passing year, ever more distant, distant
And with every passing year, ever closer, closer
Is our blazing youth,
Friends I will never see....

Friends and school friends. Schoolgirls besieging Komsomol raykoms--the doors of military commissariats were closed to those under 18. Thin, brittle like children, romantic like children.

They all marched from their secondary school,
From philosophy departments, from MEI and from MAI.
The flower of youth. The Komsomol elite.
My Turgenev-like girls!...

At first both the raykoms and military commissariats did not look at these girls very cordially.

We, girls, were not welcomed enthusiastically,
A hoarse military commissar chased us home.
This was in '41. The medals
And other regalia came later....

It was then that the names of partisan Zoya Kosmodem'yanskaya, sniper Lyudmila Pavlichenko, medical instructor Natasha Khchuyevskaya and many, many other heroines thundered at the front and the rear.

According to statistics, more than 800,000 women served in the armed forces. What about partisans and clandestine workers?

Never, at no time has there been a war in which women have played such a tremendous role as in the Great Patriotic War. Entire regiments--antiaircraft, communications, night bombers--were made up entirely of women. Many military professions became "women's" at that time.

There were tank women and snipers, engineers and political workers.

"One could hardly find a military skill with which our courageous women could not cope as well as their brothers, husbands and fathers," Marshal of the Soviet Union A. I. Yeremenko wrote.

Today the very words "woman front veteran" sound like an award. Yet at that time....

I am looking back into the foggy distance--
No, it was no merit during that sinister year
But a high honor for a schoolgirl, to be allowed
To die for her people.

Why was it so? Whatever one may say, war is not for women.

Perhaps the answer to this question may be found partially in the letter written by the Sevastopol machine gunner Nina Onilova. In her unfinished letter interrupted by her death, addressed to the actress who had played the role of Anka in the film "Chapayev," Nina acknowledged that her greatest dream was to be a little bit like the heroine in that film.

Yes, we grew up prisoners of the romanticism of the civil war. Who among us could fail to react to the melancholy lines of Mikhail Svetlov:

The attack thundered and bullets whizzed,
And the machine gun smoothly poured its fire....
And our girl marched in her greatcoat,
The burning Kakhovka is coming....

My generation as well had its "burning Kakhovka," whether its name was Stalingrad or Kerch or a remote hamlet in the swamps of the Belorussian Polesye.

...Many years after the war, a German asked me the following, in West Berlin: "I was regimental surgeon on the Eastern Front and I know quite well what war means. It is above all that which kills everything that is human in the human. I cannot understand how a woman, who has experienced the front has been able not only to remain a woman but even to become a poet?"

I answered as follows: "In my view, everything is based on the fact that you were the soldiers of an aggressive army, whereas we were in an army of liberation. You invaded a foreign country, killing, torturing, plundering.

Naturally, this is possible only when everything human has either been destroyed or at least lulled in your soul. Otherwise one would simply become insane.... What have verses or poetry to do with it? But why should the human die in the soul of the people who are defending their children, their relatives and their homes? These are people who are forced to kill, defending themselves."

No, we did not stop being human. Naturally, we learned how to hate but we did not unlearn how to love. It seems to me that after the war we felt even more sharply the happiness of living, and, having suffered, take closer to our hearts the suffering of others.

It was no accident that in the postwar upsurge of Soviet poetry poets created by the front played the main role. Naturally, they included women veterans of the Great Patriotic War.

During the war about half of all medical personnel in the armed forces of our homeland were women.

They included those who gave first aid in combat, who bandaged the people and pulled them out of the fire. "Medical instructor" was the official title of these girls but the troops called them "sister" or "little sister." The older ones called them "daughter."

These "little sisters" and "daughters" flowed along with the avalanches of cavalry or tank attacks, marched in the desperate chains of the marines or were simply part of the infantry. There was no arm in which the soldiers of mercy were not fighting.

They were always in short supply on the front lines, for they were the first to fall. If a heavily wounded soldier remained under fire, naturally, one of his comrades could crawl to him. The medical instructor, however, had to do this, for his military duty was precisely to provide first aid and evacuate casualties from the battlefield.

Pale, gritting her teeth to the breaking point,
Alone in the trench
You must jump and across the parapet
Find yourself under fire.

You must. Although you may not come back,
Although "Do not dare!" the battalion commander repeats.
Even tanks (they are made of steel)
Are burning three steps away.

YOU MUST! For you cannot pretend
That you do not hear in the night
The almost hopeless "Little sister!"
Shouted by someone over there, under fire....

The soldiers, who knew that the "little sister" would never abandon them in trouble, repaid her with fraternal love and infinite respect. This is

precious.... The front-line soldier must believe in the medical instructor. The soldier fears more than anything else that, wounded and helpless, he may be abandoned on the battlefield, for all sorts of things happen in war, particularly at the beginning....

Sometimes the girl would not be strong enough. She would desperately want to loosen up the fingers of the wounded to remove his rifle, which will make dragging him easier. The soldier, however, clings to it as if his life depends on it. He may be virtually unconscious but his hands remember the first order of the soldier--never, under any circumstance, throw your weapon away. He pays no attention to the nurse's oath that she will not leave the rifle behind....

Sometimes, after a television program in which I would participate, the telephone would ring or a letter would come from some veteran or other, claiming that it was me who saved his life. He believes that he recognized me on the screen....

Alas, this is usually an error. It turns out that we either fought in the same unit but at different times, or at the same time but in different units.

The error is natural, for a man whose blood was draining was not aware enough to notice who was pulling him out of the battle. At that time he did not ask for the nurse's name, nor was she interested in the names of the wounded. All she thought about was to take him to the first available shelter.

Yes, to the wounded the nurse who saved him usually remained unknown. This was the most profound selflessness of her exploit. Many are the veterans who recall today with tenderness and gratitude their nameless rescuers!

I unwittingly feel guilty when I have to tell a person that it was not me who pulled him out of the battle. We were all alike--thin, grubby, looking like children and all of us looking alike.

And the tomb of the "unknown nurse" so far exists only in the grateful memory of the soldiers.

The soldiers, who the girls of Russia
(Remember the exploding towns and the fires?)
Pulled out of the battlefield--
Where is the tomb of the "unknown nurse?"...

Battalion medical instructor Zinaida Samsonova was killed during one of the unsuccessful attacks on the little hamlet of Kholm in the Polesye, in the damp Belorussian winter of 1944. Zinka, a girl who had already become legendary on our front, was famous in the 218th Infantry Red Banner Romodansko-Kiev Division.

On the front line, where everyone is a hero,
And where death awards all medals,
Her simple name
Began to shine more brightly than the others.

It was no accident that the soldiers joked that "Zinka commands the battalion." She was always up front and if a girl marches ahead, could a man show fear?... Those who would hesitate and who found themselves lacking the strength to rise under the withering machine gun fire would see in front of them the calm grey eyes and hear the slightly hoarse, girlish voice: "Well, my eagle (she always called the soldiers 'eagle'), have you sunk roots? You can lie on the ground some other time!"

There were two girls in our battalion. We slept on one of the greatcoats which we spread on the snow, covering ourselves with the other and ate from the same mess tins, and how could we fail to become friends?

The war did not grant us a long friendship.

Zinka, who came out of the great battles, like those for the liberation of Stalingrad and Kiev, without a scratch, died in a battle for a small village in the forest.

Zinka led us to the attack,
We advanced along the black rye
Along the craters and the gullies
Across deadly lines.

We did not thirst for posthumous glory,
We wanted to live gloriously.
Why is this light-haired soldier
Lying swathed in blood-stained bandages?...

Zinka died, not knowing that she had been awarded the title Hero of the Soviet Union for crossing the Dnepr.... The medical school from which she graduated in the city of Yagorevsk was named after Zinaida Samsonova. The best of the voluntary medical units is named after the heroine. Many Pioneer units struggle for the honor to be named "Samsonov."

It is thus that Zinka, forever 19 years old, of my regiment remains alive, one of the front-line medics awarded the title Hero of the Soviet Union.

But what about those who "despite death" nevertheless came back home? Let me describe the typical yet exceptional fate of one of them.

Yekaterina Novikova. "Katyusha of the Guards" was the way she was known to the troops and the way her friends call her to this day.

Only yesterday's school student, Katya was awarded her first combat order at the distant approaches to Moscow. The veterans know that during those tragic times awards were rare. As the poet said then, "we were not up to medals. Let the homeland live...."

Medic Novikova, who was accompanying wounded, stopped a panic which had broken out among the troops, caused by the threat of encirclement, and led them in the attack. The wounded were saved.

In "Zarya Pobedy" [Dawn of Victory], a book of memoirs on 1941, Army General D. D. Lelyushenko wrote the following about Katya: "There was a great deal of talk at that time about this courageous girl. Her name became legendary in our army. Yet, at that time Katya was not even 18...."

A youth antifascist meeting was taking place in the Hall of Columns of the House of the Union, in Moscow, in September 1941. She left her hospital bed and rushed to the meeting in her smock, to address the meeting alongside Viktor Talalikhov and Ruben Ibarruri.

On the radio, the girl turned to the American youth. The answer was an outpouring of letters from the United States, Canada and Australia, expressing readiness to come to the aid of our country.

"Barbarous fascism will be swept off the face of the earth. The U.S. and Canadian youth answer Katya Novikova's letter," was the heading of a report from New York in KOMSOMOL'SKAYA PRAVDA.

Yevgeniy Petrov, the noted journalist, wrote about this courageous "little soldier" in his essay "Katya," which was published in OGONEK in 1942.

PRAVDA described how in a battle in the area of Severnyy Donets, Katya hurled hand grenades at a tank, killed a fascist officer and headed the counterattack.

Other newspapers wrote about Katya with headlines such as "Nurse-Soldier," "Courageous Daughter of the Homeland," and "Lieutenant Novikova--A Veteran at the Age of 20."

At the end of the war the nurse-soldier was guards senior lieutenant and commander of an infantry company. I do not know whether other women were front-line company commanders. I know, however, that many company commanders did not return home....

Katya did. She was wounded but she was just as strong and inflexible.

She was unwilling to part with the army and she entered the armor academy. Shortly afterwards, the order was issued to discharge all women. She switched to the Foreign Languages Institute and completed its course. Today she is a retired lieutenant colonel. She is still working, although, alas, she must frequently return to the hospital--the war is making itself felt....

Yekaterina Novikova is as modest as she is courageous. That is why, perhaps, after the victory, her name, which thundered during the war, was somewhat forgotten....

Pity! Such people help others to be courageous by just existing.

I described two military nurses, front-line heroes. Behind them, however, was an entire army of such heroines--famous and anonymous--those who returned and those who fell. Those who were in the epicenter of the great battle.

However, pulling a person out of the battle is only half the job. The diminishing flicker of life must then be maintained.

It was this unbearably heavy burden which fell on the semichildish shoulders of the nurses at medical battalions and field and evacuation hospitals.

Everyone knows that the life of a severely wounded or sick person greatly depends on who will spend nights sitting by his bed, moisten his cracked lips and be aware of each moan and glance. Even in peacetime it is infinitely difficult to take care of the dying. What about in wartime?...

Girls, classmates, from where did you draw your maternal wisdom and dedication then?

The nurses of medical battalions and hospitals paid their excessively high dues to victory with their youth and forever-undermined health. Sometimes with their lives as well, for evacuation hospitals as well were bombed, shelled or even encircled. At that point, defending the wounded, the sisters of mercy, like their coevals in the trenches, took up arms and became soldiers of mercy.

Need we recall that the entire concern of nurses and medics would have been futile without the clever and kind hands of military physicians? Or surgeons, who sometimes worked under fire, paying no attention to mortal danger or deadly fatigue?

And how many among them were members of the so-called "weaker sex"!

I shall never forget the story of troops in a partisan detachment about a physician, a young woman who could perform miracles...with a simple kitchen knife and a saw. War is war and anything can happen in it!

Here are dry statistical figures: during the war military medical personnel returned to the ranks more than 72 percent of the wounded and more than 90 percent of sick soldiers and officers!

Military medics, soldiers of the army of mercy or simply soldiers! Can they be forgotten?...

Let the girls of the space age of the 1980s be somewhat envious of our cruel and splendid youth, in the same way that we envied the girls of the civil war.

Not for nothing did Hero of the Soviet Union navigator in a women's aviation regiment Zhenya Rudneva, who made 645 combat sorties, write the following in her diary: "...It is war now and there is so much horror and blood around me. Yet this is probably the happiest time in my life. In any case, life in the regiment will remain my brightest memories...."

Zhenya perished but her words reached the hearts of all veterans, for a war which is just, a war of liberation, does not consist of death and suffering only. It also includes high flights of the human spirit, the ability for

exploit and self-sacrifice, to give one's life for the homeland and to deem this a great honor.

No, this is not a merit but a success--
To become a girl soldier in war.
Had my life taken a different turn
I would have found it hard on Victory Day....

"War!" A war which is like a path to the soul.
The soldiers' ranks are thinning!
I shall not betray my trench loyalty.
I shall remain a front-line nurse forever.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1935

5003

CSO: 1802/10

GLORIOUS SON OF LATIN AMERICA

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 85 (signed to press 27 Feb 85) pp 81-92

[Article by Dr of Historical Sciences N. Leonov]

[Text] Each revolution creates its own heroes. These are the people who express most fully the basic interests of the broad toiling masses, and who are ready to undergo any privation, to engage in hard work and to fight to the death for the sake of the greater good. The social revolutions of the 20th century have produced a long gallery of heroes, marking the greatest transition in the history of humankind, the transition from capitalism to socialism. Their distinguishing features are dedicated service to the ideals of the communist organization of society and the molding of the new person, the bearer of communist convictions and active maker of the history of mankind.

Ernesto Che Guevara, an Argentine by origin, a Cuban by revolutionary services and a communist-internationalist by conviction, was one such hero. Che Guevara's life and activities offer a vivid example of loyalty to revolutionary duty and to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. Che Guevara had never visited a socialist country until his first trip to the USSR in 1960, nor was he a member of the communist party until the final stage of the Cuban revolution. His life's journey is a vivid example of the evolution in the views of a systematically revolutionary democrat who came to scientific socialism through a critical analysis of the surrounding reality and a study of the classic works of the Marxist-Leninist.

It was revolutionary practice which turned Che Guevara into a communist. Having become one, Che Guevara invested all his energy, knowledge and experience in the active assertion of Marxism-Leninism. He loved to repeat the inspiring saying to the effect that "the best way of saying something is doing it." Che Guevara belongs to the brilliant company of revolutionary personalities who combine within themselves the talents of the theoretician and thinker and the qualities of a practical participant in the process of profound social change, as its organizer.

Fate granted him no more than 39 years of life. However, they sufficed to inscribe Che Guevara's name forever in the history of the world revolutionary movement. For a variety of reasons, by no means all the deserving names found

in this history have the same emotional impact on the new generations of revolutionaries. Che Guevara's life and activities carry a tremendous educational charge in this respect. Addressing a youth audience on the occasion of Jose Marti's birthday, Che said that the people's heroes must not be the passive property of history, like museum exhibits, but live participants in and makers of the history of their people. He called upon his young audience to think and act like people's heroes. At that time it was still difficult to imagine that quite soon he himself would be among the fallen yet eternally living people's heroes of Cuba, the world revolutionary movement and, in the final account, all mankind.

Che Guevara's life was marked by two characteristic features: a constant aspiration to acquire knowledge and the use of it in the interest of society. He was born on 14 June 1928 in the Argentine city of Rosario, into the family of a petty entrepreneur. At the age of 2 he became asthmatic, and he suffered from asthma for the rest of his life. His experience with this ailment influenced his choice of profession. He decided to become a physician in order to heal people's diseases. He learned to read at the age of 4 and continued to read avidly throughout his life. His range of interests was exceptionally broad but, as his father pointed out, he was particularly drawn to history.

As a student, Che Guevara traveled a great deal throughout Latin America. However, he was never a simple tourist. His trips were true universities of life. He began by touring all of Argentina on a bicycle. Then, riding an old motorcycle, he took off on a long trip through the Andean countries without a penny in his pocket. In Chile, Peru, Colombia and Venezuela he worked as dishwasher, delivery man and rafter and treated lepers.

"At that time," Che Guevara was to say later, "I was eager for victory, like anyone else. I dreamed of becoming a famous researcher and tirelessly worked to achieve the type of success which, naturally, in the final account could be used for the good of mankind but would represent my personal triumphs above all. Like everyone else, I was a child of my environment." However, after seeing the horrifying suffering of the people and the raging inequity and violence, Che started drawing different conclusions. Later on, in 1959, he described his change of outlook as follows: "At that time I realized the main thing. In order to become a physician-revolutionary, in order to become a revolutionary, there had to be a revolution. Individual efforts, lofty aspirations and the desire to sacrifice one's life for even the most noble ideals are worth nothing if the person acts alone, if he alone in his little corner of America pits himself against the hostile governments and social conditions which stand in the way of progress."

After graduating from medical school in 1953 with a brilliant record and with an offer to practice in Venezuela, with a high guaranteed salary, he quite unexpectedly chose an entirely different route and went to Bolivia. At the railroad station, saying good-bye to relatives and friends, he said something the meaning of which they were able to unravel only many years later: "An American soldier is saying good-bye to you." He alone knew that henceforth his life would be above all that of a revolutionary and only after that a physician.

He went to La Paz, the Bolivian capital, because a revolution had taken place in 1952 in that country, frequently described as a "pauper sitting on a gold throne." Its motive forces were the miners and peasants. The Bolivian revolution was anti-imperialist and antifeudal. The petite and middle national bourgeoisie, which had acceded to power and was headed by then-President Paz Estensoro, had nationalized the tin mines, undertaken agrarian reform and, in order to block the intrigues of the reactionary military, undertaken the organization of a people's militia. It was these circumstances which attracted Che Guevara, who wanted to dedicate his life to the service of the revolution.

However, having plunged deeper into the Bolivian reality, Che Guevara saw all the limitations and inconsistencies in the policy of the bourgeois government, its fear of the United States, and the clogging of the governmental apparatus with embezzlers of public funds and a variety of fellow travelers. The Bolivian Communist Party, which had been founded in 1950, was still very weak, and its influence was limited. Disappointment in the Bolivian revolution turned his attention to Guatemala, where the revolutionary process was entering its culminating stage at that time. It was headed by Colonel Jacobo Arbenz, who had taken an unparalleled "dare"--to confiscate the neglected land belonging to the omnipotent master of Central America--the U.S. United Fruit Company. Che Guevara arrived in Guatemala in December 1953, when the sinister threat of American intervention was hanging over that small country. An army of mercenaries was being assembled openly in Honduras, with instructions from Washington to suppress the Guatemalan revolution.

Che Guevara's efforts to participate actively in the political struggle yielded no results. Guatemalan Ministry of Health bureaucrats refused to recognize his medical diploma or to allow Che Guevara to work as a physician even in the most remote part of the country. The Guatemalan leftist parties, including the communists, were particularly wary of the foreigners who were in the country on the eve of the disaster. Essentially, they were already making preparations for going into clandestinity. Working as a book peddler to survive, Che Guevara sought answers to the questions which disturbed him, which had to do with the social liberation of the masses. He became acquainted with a group of Cuban revolutionaries who were members of the detachment set up by Fidel Castro which had stormed the Moncada Barracks in 1953 and had left Cuba for Guatemala after the failure of the uprising. His new friends included the Cubans Antonio Lopez Fernandez ("Niko"), Mario Delmau and Dario Lopez--the future members of the expedition aboard the "Granma." According to Mario Delmau, "at that time he [Che Guevara--the author] had already developed a sufficiently clear Marxist outlook. He had studied Marx and Lenin and had read an entire library of Marxist literature."

The 1953 intervention mounted by the American mercenaries brought about the doom of the Guatemalan revolution. Che was forced to seek asylum in the Argentine embassy and then leave for Mexico.

In remembering the Guatemala of that time, Guevara frequently discussed the question of the role of individuals in the revolutionary process under specific Latin American conditions. He emphasized the specifically subjective

nature of its shortcomings. He accused Arbenz and the other leaders of the Guatemalan revolution of failing to fulfill their duty to the people of the country completely by not raising the question of arming the entire nation and launching a people's war, preferring loss of power and emigration.

Che Guevara claimed that a political leader trusted by the masses has no right to display personal weakness and to refuse the responsibility entrusted to him at a critical moment in history. He should carry out his duty to the end and, if necessary, sacrifice his life for his convictions.

It was in Fidel Castro, the leader of a group of Cuban revolutionaries who had gathered in Mexico City and were preparing to mount an expedition to Cuba, that Che Guevara found what he sought: the prototype of the revolutionary leader with a clear program for action, infinite faith in the justice of his ideas and a firm resolve to bring the struggle for the liberation of his people to its completion. Che saw the tremendously risky nature of this path and that the chance of victory was small. He believed, however, that this was the only way worth following. "To die for such a pure ideal on the shores of a foreign country is not too bad," he wrote later.

As we know, several days after they disembarked in Cuba from the yacht "Granma," the detachment of revolutionaries was surrounded, partially destroyed and dispersed by the punitive Batista forces in uneven combat. This was the first and last defeat of Fidel's fighters in the revolutionary war. This battle was noteworthy in that during it, Che had to decide whether to be a soldier or a physician. Here is the way he described this himself: "Next to me was a medical kit and a cartridge case. They were too heavy to be carried together. I took the cartridge case and ran to the reeds."

The revolutionary war, which lasted more than 2 years, was the period of Che Guevara's development as one of the key organizers and leaders of the rebel forces. After the victorious hard battles of the first period of the war, Fidel's detachment quickly retreated to the mountains to get rid of the pursuers. The decision was made to put the wounded in a sheltered place in Che Guevara's charge. Guevara accepted this assignment fraught with mortal danger without hesitation. Fortunately, the punitive forces failed to locate the rebel camp, and after a while Che was able to take his entire detachment, with its weaponry, to Fidel. When the formation of a second rebel column to engage in independent operations in another area of the Sierra Maestra Mountains was undertaken (the first was commanded by Fidel himself), Fidel Castro entrusted its command precisely to Che Guevara, who had earned this honor thanks to his extensive political training, outstanding organizational capability and personal courage. Guevara was the first "barbudo" in the Sierra Maestra to whom Fidel awarded the highest military rank of the rebels--Comandante.

Che Guevara carried out all of his assignments with total dedication, showing proper judgment and presence of mind. Che was the first to organize the work of the rear guard of the rebel army. He set up shoe repair stores and bakeries and concerned himself with food supplies. In addition to all of this, he remained a physician.

During a guerrilla raid, Che ordered the procurement of equipment for the publication of a guerrilla newspaper, which soon began to come out under the title EL CUBANO LIBRE. Guevara, who published his articles under the pseudonym "Sniper," advised the young fighters on better ways to defeat the enemy.

The march of the partisan column commanded by Che Guevara from the Sierra Maestra to Escambre, the mountainous forest massif located in the center of the island, was a most severe trial. The troops advanced through impossible swamps and thick brush, avoiding clashes with the army units blocking the roads, occupied settlements and set ambushes at all possible points where the guerrillas could be expected to cross. Guevara's supporters, the overwhelming majority of whom consisted of 16-to-18-year-old adolescents he had trained in the Sierra Maestra, passed the stern test with honors. As his comrades testified, the leader of the column, who invariably was the last to retire, became so tired that on one occasion he fell asleep on his feet and, without waking up, collapsed as though he had been mowed down--to the great concern of his closest friends. Having taken his entire combat-capable column to the Escambre by mid-October 1958, Che Guevara saw that there, along with the detachments of true revolutionaries, there were armed groups engaged mainly in plundering the population. The leaders of these groups considered themselves the masters of Escambre and were unwilling to submit to revolutionary discipline. Some officers on Guevara's staff even urged that arms be used against the anarchic elements. Great political farsightedness and diplomatic tactfulness were needed to isolate the most dangerous adventuristic leaders gradually, without shedding any blood, and to win the misled people over to the side of the revolution and establish a people's regime in Escambre.

Having occupied the Escambre area, and allowing time for the troops to tend to their wounds and rest somewhat, Che undertook active combat operations, drawing enemy forces away from the Sierra Maestra. With his tremendous moral-psychological superiority over the enemy and relying on the population's support, Che Guevara attacked Santa Clara, a major transportation junction and the capital of Las Villas Province, which was defended by a garrison of government troops triple the size of the rebel force. Che headed a detachment of no more than 300 people. The boldness of the operation, the speed with which the guerrillas acted and their desperate courage and resourcefulness crushed the resistance of the Batista forces. Cuba was split into halves by the rebel army. A panic broke out in the dictator's camp. This marked the beginning of the end of the tyranny. Politically, the general strike mounted by the progressive forces, among which the communists played the most important role, marked the total collapse of the dictatorship.

The troops of the rebel army, under Fidel Castro's command, entered Santiago de Cuba on 1 January 1959. The following day, two columns of rebels, commanded by Che Guevara and Camilo Cienfuegos, entered Havana. Che was happy to be able to see the exultant people welcome the victory of the revolution.

The people of Cuba did not forget the merit of the heroes who had dedicated their lives to the cause of the struggle for freedom. The decision to award Che Guevara Cuban citizenship as a native, approved on 9 February 1959 as a special supplement to the Constitution, was an expression of the highest

appreciation of the role he had played in the revolutionary war of liberation. It stipulated that such rights are awarded only to those foreigners who had fought in the ranks of the rebel army for no less than 2 years and had held the high military rank of comandante for no less than 1 year. Che Guevara was the only qualifying foreigner in Cuba. No, Che was not born in Cuba, but he risked his life for its freedom on many occasions. In the entire history of Cuba, this was only the second time such a high assessment of the merits of a foreign citizen had been made. The first such citizenship was granted to the Dominican Maximo Gomez, who became the commander in chief of the Cuban army of liberation fighting the Spanish colonizers at the end of the 19th century. Che was able to dedicate his efforts to constructive toil for a period of slightly more than 5 years after the victory of the revolution, but in that area as well he made a profound mark. His first appointment was to the position of comandante of the La Cabana Fortress, which controlled the entrance to the port of Havana and dominated the old part of the city. Several months later, he became head of the industrialization department of the National Institute for Agrarian Reform. Later he headed the National Bank of Cuba and, from 23 February 1961 to the last days of his stay in Cuba, he directed the work of the newly created Ministry of Industry.

Throughout all of that time, he remained on active military service and, a person of unusual modesty, he refused a ministerial salary, considering that the salary of a comandante in the revolutionary armed forces was fully adequate. During moments of particular importance to the fate of the revolution, Che Guevara set aside his peaceful profession and for a while concentrated entirely on military matters. Such was the case, for example, in the autumn of 1962, when Fidel assigned the army command in the Pinar del Rio Province to Che Guevara. While the threat lasted, Guevara made preparations for repelling the U.S. aggression from his command center in a mountain cave.

His talent as a communist leader was most brilliantly displayed in constructive toil under conditions of peace. However, Che Guevara was not only an organizer and leader in the military and economic areas. However great his contributions were as minister or commander, his personality, the example he set as a communist, the inseparable links between his ideological views and his daily activities, and his crystal purity as a Marxist-Leninist who had dedicated himself fully to the cause of the struggle for communism, had a vastly greater influence on the development of the Cuban revolution and, subsequently, the national liberation movement in many other countries. Che Guevara was a member of the supreme leadership of the "26 July Movement" and when that organization merged with the "13 March Revolutionary Directorate" and the People's Socialist (Communist) Party, he became member of the leadership of the United Revolutionary Organizations. He then became member of the Secretariat of the National Leadership of the United Party of the Socialist Revolution. Che was not a member of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee, for by the time it was founded (October 1965), he had already resigned from all party and state positions in Cuba, preparing for the Bolivian stage of his struggle against imperialism.

Guevara believed that the main task of the Marxist-Leninist party in Cuba was to mold the new person. Socialism, he wrote, "is not developed simply for the sake of having our own outstanding plants, but for the comprehensively

developed individual. The person must change along with the progress in production, and we would not be able to resolve the problem properly if we become merely the makers of commodities and raw materials without also being the makers of people." The party alone can resolve this complex historical problem. As the inspirer and organizer of the masses, as Che Guevara frequently emphasized, the party must be inseparably linked with the people. It must learn from the people and arm them with precise and clear party directives. Strict party discipline, based on the principles of democratic centralism, does not exclude but, conversely, presumes the constant creative discussion of problems and criticism and self-criticism as the means of steadily improving party work.

He was exceptionally strict in his demands on party cadres and members, drawing their attention to the fact that the party will become the true vanguard and authoritative educator of the masses only when each one of its members can embody the qualities of representative of the working class and all working people most fully within himself. In addressing textile factory workers in Ariguanabo on what a party member should be, Che Guevara pointed out that "what the ordinary man would consider self-sacrifice should be a natural and daily occurrence for a party member." In paying tremendous attention to methods of party persuasion like personal example, Che Guevara was constitutionally unable to tolerate those who engaged in idle talk, always demanding that everyone maintain the inseparable unity of words and actions.

In his article "Socialism and Personality in Cuba," he wrote: "The party is a living example and its cadre workers must be models of industriousness and dedication. It is through their actions that they must lead the masses to the full achievement of revolutionary objectives. This presumes years and years of intensive struggle against construction difficulties, the class enemy, the ulcers of the past and imperialism." Che Guevara considered the progressive workers recommended by their comrades for party membership to be the best party reserve. At the same time, he believed that the party must firmly expel from its ranks those whose behavior compromised the high title of party member. Thus, it was his conviction that there should be no place in the party for those who work poorly at their jobs or fail to cope with their assigned sectors. "Any rank-and-file party member," he wrote, "must be distinguished by labor results, a thirst for knowledge, a great awareness of duty and a daily and constant aspiration toward improvement and the promotion of the ideas of socialism among his comrades through his personal labor example and self-dedication."

Che emphasized that the success of the party's leading work in the education of the new person depends on the reputation it has acquired among the masses through its daily work. While actively propagandizing something which may still appear to some as maximalistic views on the role and place of the communist in society, Che Guevara observed them in life simply and naturally. As one of the initiators of the movement for the voluntary participation of employees in productive labor, Che Guevara established a so-called "Red Battalion," which included some 130 party members, in his Ministry of Industry. Che Guevara, the minister, commanded the battalion personally. Membership was voluntary but the members assumed the obligation to work 240 hours per year in material production during their days off and after work.

Che Guevara led his comrades through his personal example: he worked as a loader at sugar plants, cut sugar cane, worked as a bricklayer's mate in construction, etc. He rarely spent a day off at home and was among the first to fulfill the set norm.

He was frequently asked about the usefulness of such work if a person lacked the proper skills, habits and so on. Che answered that although important, material results are not the main objective in voluntary communist labor. Above all, voluntary work molds the new person and his attitude toward work. It strengthens the ties among the different detachments of working people and enables management workers to become more closely acquainted with the problems in material production.

Generally, consideration of the real labor contribution of the person was characteristic of Che Guevara, as the criterion for assessing a revolutionary was characteristic of Che Guevara. Under the specific conditions of the first postwar years in Cuba, because of to the low level of literacy, the long years of indoctrinating the people in an anticommunist spirit before the revolution and the need for the time being to avoid making the full depth of the program drafted by the leaders of the revolution, it was not realistic to speak of the firmness of Marxist-Leninist ideology among the masses. The word "revolutionary" was comprehensively used instead of "communist," although the same meaning was invested in both. Unquestionably, Che Guevara was one of the most energetic, persistent and skillful propagandists of the ideas of scientific socialism in Cuba. The press, radio and television became the rostrum from which the most prestigious leaders of the revolution explained consistently and with great tactfulness to the entire nation that by effecting a revolution, the Cubans were essentially supporting socialism and a program for the reorganization of society on a socialist basis.

In the period of his sociopolitical activities in Cuba, Che Guevara delivered 172 speeches, each one of which is sui generis a complex of communist convictions and a passionate call for the creation of a new society and the molding of the new person. Che's collected essays, articles and speeches were published in Cuba after his death. They total nine volumes which have become handbooks for the practitioners of revolutionary change in Cuba and elsewhere and for the students of that outstanding phenomenon in the global revolutionary process, the Cuban revolution.

Under all circumstances, even the worst, Che never parted company with his pen and notebook, clearly recording all the characteristic features of each event like a researcher. His work "Guerrilla Warfare," in which tremendous practical material and the experience of the rebel army are collected and summed up, is well known. This work is a real textbook for anyone promoting a national liberation and revolutionary-democratic movement through partisan warfare.

He is also the author of "Episodes of the Revolutionary War," a brilliant narration of the Cuban revolution. The strict simplicity of presentation, which merely emphasizes the historical significance of the events, and the whole gallery of portraits of the real participants in the events, with all of their positive and negative qualities, make up the artistic merit of this

splendid work which, when published, laid no claim whatsoever to being a work of literature. True to himself, Che Guevara valued most of all truthfulness in the printed word. In his author's preface to "Episodes of the Revolutionary War," Che called upon his comrades in arms to write their memoirs, thus adding to the history of events. He persistently demanded above extreme truthfulness above all, overriding any effort to present oneself in an attractive manner, and unyielding veracity. This was all for Che: "Truth, only truth, and nothing but truth."

A tireless thirst for knowledge was quite characteristic of Che. Books were his constant companions. As the manager of the National Bank of Cuba and aware of his lack of mathematical knowledge, Che reached an agreement with a university professor to study with him twice weekly, covering the entire course in higher mathematics in 1.5 years. His greatest attention, however, was focused on the study of the works of the Marxist-Leninist classics and on general social studies and economics. Continually adding to his knowledge, Che Guevara unfailingly shared it with his comrades. Wherever he happened to be through the will of fate, he unfailingly set up schools or courses or invented new methods with which to upgrade the political and cultural standards of his comrades.

A high level of education and culture is a mandatory prerequisite for every communist who sets himself the task of convincing others of the justice of the ideas of scientific socialism. Capitalism, Che said, deliberately molded the person to suit its needs. We communists must mold a new person--the conscious maker of history.

Che ascribed tremendous importance in the education of the new person to labor and labor activeness, not only through methods such as voluntary Saturday and Sunday work but through the daily production process as well. He continuously explained to the working people the nature of ownership and of labor itself, which had changed after the revolution, and he called for the fastest possible shaping of conscious labor discipline. Che Guevara essentially relied on moral incentives to upgrade labor productivity and to develop initiative comprehensively. Finally, he believed that "a good example is as contagious as a bad one."

He pointed out that there are good people who are courageously willing to fight the enemy with arms but are unable to engage in dedicated daily production work. That is why in his speeches he equated a place by a machine tool with one in a combat trench, describing absenteeism as one of the most treacherous forms of counterrevolution. He described those who build socialism faster and better as winners in the socialist competition. In emphasizing the decisive role of economics in the destiny of the revolution, Che said that "no revolution can strengthen and advance unless it is backed by economic successes. Revolutionary ideology and the ability of the masses to assert great political principles depend on economic accomplishments, on the noticeable and continuing improvements in the population's living standard."

However passionately Che Guevara may have dealt with problems of building socialism in Cuba, his main vocation in life was that of a revolutionary. He frequently said in conversations with people close to him that however

difficult the problems of building socialism may be, they can nevertheless be resolved by the new generations, who will work under conditions in which the political system is already firmly in the hands of the people. He said that he would like to spur his Rocinante on to fight evil in other latitudes. Once again he made Bolivia his choice.

From the socioeconomic viewpoint, this country, which Che Guevara regarded as the future base of the revolutionary movement in South America, was a real powder keg, where an organized and politically trained working class (mining workers mainly) was gathering strength to oppose the pro-imperialist military dictatorship weapons in hand. Such actions, however, were restrained by the lack of the needed unity among the various detachments of leftist forces. Guevara also took into consideration the actual condition of the Bolivian armed forces which, although seemingly an impressive power in the country's political arena, was in fact no major military obstacle to the development of a mass revolutionary movement. A secret sector engaged in preparations for the establishment on the country's territory of a large center of anti-imperialist struggle was set up in Bolivia. From the very beginning, Che firmly resolved to head this action.

Providing international assistance in the struggle against the common enemy has been and remains a great tradition of the Latin American peoples. During the struggle for liberation from the Spanish colonizers, Simon Bolivar, a Venezuelan by birth, conducted campaigns in Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru. Argentine patriots commanded by San-Martin took part in the liberation of Chile and Peru. A Mexican corps commanded by General Filisola went to the aid of the peoples of Central America. In the 1850s, forces from the Central American states jointly waged a national liberation war on Nicaraguan territory against an army of American freebooters commanded by William Walker, who restored slavery in Nicaragua and intended to incorporate all of Central America in the slaveowning U.S. South. Toward the end of the 19th century, the Dominican Maximo Gomez, as we have pointed out, was one of the leaders of the Cuban liberation army. Representatives of almost 10 Latin American countries fought the American forces which had occupied Nicaragua in the army of Augusto Santino, the "free people's general." Therefore there was nothing unusual in Che Guevara's decision. It was a natural extension of his struggle against U.S. imperialism--the main enemy of all Latin Americans.

Che Guevara returned from a 3-month trip abroad on 14 March 1965. He no longer attended public functions, disappearing without a trace for a full 30 months, before the day the world learned of his tragic death.

On 3 October 1965 Fidel Castro made public the final letter written to him by Che Guevara. It said: "Other lands in this world demand the contribution of my modest efforts. I can do what has been denied you because of your responsible position as the leader of Cuba; the time for us to part has come....

"Know that I am doing this with mixed feelings of joy and pain: I leave behind my purest hopes as a builder and the people who are most precious to me.... I leave behind a people who accepted me as their son; this pains my soul. I shall carry the faith which you developed in me, the revolutionary

spirit of my people and the feeling that I am fulfilling the most sacred duty of fighting imperialism wherever it is found to the new battlefield...."

We know from the testimony of Che's closest friends that before leaving Cuba, he undertook a training course during which he changed his appearance entirely. Guevara stoically suffered the melted paraffin which was used to pull out the roots of his hair. Then false teeth were prepared for him. They which entirely changed his appearance but prevented him from eating solid food. In any case, in September 1966, when he was introduced as Ramon to a group of internationalist fighters, every one of whom knew Che Guevara well, not a single one of them recognized him.

The guerrilla epic in Bolivia took almost 1 year. On 7 October 1967, i.e., one day before his death, he recorded in his diary what had taken place after 11 months of participation in the struggle. The history of Che Guevara's unit is well-known, above all thanks to this private diary, miraculously rescued after Guevara was captured by "rangers," special-purpose detachments. Displaying tremendous self-discipline, endurance and courage, Che recorded everything worthy of his attention day after day.

The reasons for the failure of this revolutionary project become understandable after reading Che's diary, the books of Guido Peredo ("Inti"), his closest aide in Bolivia, and the memoirs of the participants in the Bolivian drama, the Cubans Leonardo Tamayo and Harry Villegas. First of all, we must realize that Che Guevara's attempt to provide a sort of impetus to the revolution on the continent was launched at a time of noticeable decline in the revolutionary movement. Toward the end of 1966, at the time Che showed up in Bolivia, 2 years had passed since the fall of the democratic government in Brazil. Only a year before that, U.S. Marines had suppressed the action of the patriots in the Dominican Republic. In Bolivia itself, the reactionary General Barrientos, who had effected a military coup d'etat, was the head of state. Guerrilla activities in Argentina, Peru, Venezuela and many other countries, which had broken out under the direct influence of the example set by the Cuban revolution, had been routed by the mid-1960s. In other words, in the period between 1964, when Che began to select people for his detachment and to formulate a plan of operations, and 1966, when he personally tried to inspire a new upsurge in the revolutionary movement, the situation on the continent had changed substantially.

Naturally, Che Guevara had seen these changes and his plans did not contemplate any immediate development of combat operations in the zone of Camp Nyancauasú in Bolivia at all. According to his plans, the site of his small detachment was to serve as a training center for the entire period needed for the consolidation of the revolutionary forces, and would then become the rear base and hospital for the guerrilla army. The presumed area for future combat operations itself was considerably to the north of Camp Nyancauasú. It was covered by denser forests and had a significantly larger population and more developed lines of communication. The socioeconomic conditions and the level of political activeness among the people in that zone justified the hope of a more rapid increase in the size of the guerrilla army.

Unfortunately, Che's plan failed because of a series of accidental adverse circumstances, which resulted in the premature detection of the guerrilla camp by the punitive forces and the forced initiation of combat operations under extremely disadvantageous conditions. The enemy was essentially helped by traitors who led the "rangers" along Che Guevara's tracks. On 8 October 1967, the handful of guerrillas were surrounded by government forces in a ravine not far from the small La Igüera site. Most of the detachment perished in the battle, while the badly wounded Che Guevara was captured and killed on direct orders from Washington. However, even after death, he inspired fear in his enemies. Che Guevara's body was destroyed so that his grave would not become a sacred revolutionary site. The squalid rural school building where this ugly imperialist crime was committed was burned down.

However, the people will gratefully remember the true fighters for human happiness forever. One of his last published documents could be taken as a political testament. It was sent from Bolivia to the Tricontinental Conference, which was held in Havana in 1967, and in it Che wrote: "All of our actions are a call for struggle against imperialism, a call for unity of the peoples in the face of the enemy of mankind--the United States. Wherever death may find us, we shall accept it with open arms if we know that our call for struggle has reached receptive ears, that another hand has been extended to take up our arms, and that other people are singing the funeral hymn in the language of machine guns, combat calls and shouts of victory."

Fidel Castro once commented that one should never speak of Che Guevara in the past tense. He provided the fullest and most profound assessment of Guevara's personality in his 18 October 1967 speech at the funeral ceremony held in Havana to mourn the death of this heroic guerrilla. Noting the unique qualities of Che as an unsurpassable soldier and leader, Fidel said: "As a revolutionary, a communist revolutionary, and a true communist, he had infinite faith in moral values. He had infinite faith in the consciousness of the people. We must say that in his mind, he saw moral incentives as the main lever for building communism in human society with absolute clarity."

Fidel emphasized that Che embodied qualities which are rarely found together. "It was difficult to be this person's equal and virtually impossible to surpass him. We must also say, however, that individuals like him can create similar people through their example."

Today the anniversary of Che's death is a day when children are accepted into the Pioneer organization. Every year, tens of thousands of the children for whose happiness he gave his life swear to continue his cause.

Today as they have done in the past as well, bourgeois and reformist ideologues, clinging parasitically to Che's imaginary or actual errors or passing delusions during different periods in his life and revolutionary struggle, are trying to cast aspersions on his bright image. Deliberately coloring Guevara's activities with anarchic tones which were alien to him, they are doing everything possible to pit him against the international communist and worker movements. These are futile efforts. Yet, Che Guevara's path to scientific socialism and the communist ranks was not an easy one. It had its difficulties and problems. The main thing, however, is that this was

the path of a true revolutionary, an inflexible fighter for the triumph of social progress and the freedom and happiness of the working people and for the practical implementation of the great doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

Once, in commenting on N. G. Chernyshevskiy's merit, V. I. Lenin said: "...He not only proved that any properly thinking and acting and decent person must be a revolutionary, but something else, which was even more important: what a revolutionary should be and what his rules should be, how he should pursue his object and the ways and means he uses for reaching it. All of his errors fade in the face of such merit...." ("V. I. Lenin o Literature i Iskusstve" [V. I. Lenin on Literature and the Arts]. Moscow, 1979, pp 649-650). Although this Leninist statement belongs to an entirely different age it can be applied with full justification in assessing Che Guevara's historical role.

In a letter to one of his numerous correspondents, he once remarked that "...If you are able to shudder with indignation whenever an injustice is committed in this world, you and I are comrades...." Che Guevara's name has become a kind of symbol of passionate revolutionary thrust, of irreconcilable opposition to the evil, injustice and violence which reign in the capitalist world.

Che's life exploits, haloed by the revolutionary romanticism, purity and selflessness of his motivations and actions, are close to the hearts of and understood by the fighters against oppression and exploitation throughout the world. They are in harmony with the feelings and noble aspirations of the millions of young people in Western Europe, North and South America and Asian and African countries who, opposing the injustice and immorality of capitalism, the arms race unleashed by Washington and the threat of nuclear catastrophe, which it has caused to increase today, will tomorrow, in the course of the evolution of their views, and having surmounted all kinds of errors and illusions, take up the great ideas of scientific socialism and join the ranks of the communist and worker parties.

Che Guevara and his life and activities are convincing proof of the great creative force of Marxist-Leninist doctrine. He belongs to all the revolutionaries on our planet. He inspires and will continue to inspire ever-new generations of people in the struggle against imperialism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/10

STRATEGY OF DEEPENING COOPERATION OF CEMA COUNTRIES

AU230601 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 85 (signed to press 27 Feb 85)
pp 93-103

[B. Ladygin and O. Chukanov--capitalized passages published in italics in original]

[Text] Speaking at the Kremlin reception in honor of the participants of the Economic Conference of CEMA Member Countries at the highest level on 14 June 1984, Comrade K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, emphasized that "even good decisions do not produce results on their own if no real and purposeful actions are taken to implement them." It can be noted that, in the period since the conference, the USSR and other CEMA countries have already made big steps to implement their coordinated decisions.

The highest organs of central committees of the communist and workers parties of CEMA countries have comprehensively discussed the results of the conference. They have been highly appraised by all fraternal parties. It is on the basis of these principled appraisals and conclusions that all fraternal countries are now developing extensive activity to carry out the agreements achieved. In September 1984, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo discussed the measures to ensure the fulfillment of the conference's goals and outlined concrete ways of attaining them. The 30th CEMA session in Havana in October 1984 constructively discussed many aspects of the progress of the implementation of the conference's decisions.

The course toward intensifying specialization and cooperation in the scientific-technical and production spheres is one of the main directions of the contemporary strategy of socialist economic integration. The transition to increasingly deep and stable forms of the division of labor represents a natural law of development of production forces. As the scale of production operations increases and new types of products and new technologies appear, so the effect of this law increases. It is beyond the capacity of a single country to master all types of production in the economically optimal proportions and at the highest technical level within the framework of its own production activities. The production of a little of everything by everyone means high production costs and low quality and that, in its turn, means lagging behind the highest world standards. And it goes without saying that

the socialist community's countries do not intend to lag behind the technically developed capitalist states. On the contrary, using the advantages of planned economies, they intend to continue not only to maintain their supremacy in the rates of growth but also to catch up with the West within a short period in those sectors of technical progress where they are still lagging. Therefore, the task of deepening the mutual division of labor in the scientific-technical and production spheres is not only an important economic but also a great political task and the communist and workers parties of CEMA countries will assiduously control the fulfillment of this task.

I

The advance of cooperation within the CEMA framework is built on a solid scientific and material-technical basis and quite close mutual links between the fraternal states in virtually all national economic spheres.

In the field of science, the CEMA countries already show a considerable number of joint achievements in the study of outer space and of land and ocean resources, in the physics, including nuclear physics research, in chemistry and biology and in many other fields. A considerable part of the world scientific-technical potential is now concentrated in the socialist community and considerable experience has been accumulated in a coordinated utilization of this potential of the community. At present, approximately 200 institutions of the national academies of sciences and about 3,000 other scientific organizations participate in the scientific-technical cooperation between CEMA countries. About 20,000 joint scientific projects and applied science projects have been carried out.

A considerable number of good examples of effective interaction has been accumulated in the sphere of production specialization and cooperation, especially in the machine-building industry. The enormous and rapidly growing variety of products of this industry makes necessary also planned coordination of production programs between the interested states. Taking into account the decisive importance of the machine-building industry for ensuring a frontal technical progress of the entire national economy, CEMA countries are developing this sphere of production at preferential rates of growth. Thus, whereas the total industrial production of CEMA countries was doubled in the period from 1970 to 1983, the output of their machine-building industries nearly tripled in that period.

The average proportional share of the machine-building industry now amounts to one-third of the overall industrial production of CEMA European countries and continues to grow. This development has been ensured to a great extent as a result of the development of deep forms of mutual division of labor. More than 150 multilateral accords and agreements on production specialization and cooperation alone are now in effect and more than 100 of these accords and agreements are in effect in the machine-building industry. Some of these agreements are unprecedented in world practice as far as the scale of intrabranch cooperation is concerned. The joint exports of the CEMA countries' machine building industries are growing very rapidly. They have increased by nearly 30 percent in the last 3 years alone and mutual volume of specialized production has increased by 60 percent in the same period. The

proportion share of the output of specialized productions in the overall volume of mutual exports of products of the machine building industries of CEMA countries amounts now to 41 percent.

All this has not been achieved at once but is the result of long and purposeful collective work.

The PRODUCTION OF ROLLER BEARINGS without which virtually no branch of the machine-building industry could now manage represented one of the earliest lines of production specialization within the CEMA framework. And it is no accident that, having adopted the course of intensified industrialization at the time of the founding of CEMA, the fraternal countries immediately felt--as early as at the beginning of the 1950s--the need for cooperation in the rapidly developing bearings industry. This task was neither simple nor was it solved quickly. It was only in 1964 that an agreement on forming the Organization of Cooperation in the Bearings Industry (OCBI) was successfully drafted and concluded. This organization's coordinating activity has made it possible to triple the production of bearings, to raise their per capita production in CEMA countries to the level of developed capitalist states and to achieve independence from the West in these very important products that had been in short supply previously. Production specialization now includes nearly 4,000 standard-size bearings, and in this connection 75 percent of their output is concentrated in one of the countries involved. The proportional share of products of specialized production operations in the overall mutual exports of bearings of CEMA countries amounts to nearly 90 percent.

Deep and considerably stable production specialization has been developed in the shipbuilding industry. The production specialization has been made possible in many respects, if not mainly, by the Soviet Union's regular and constantly growing orders for ships and equipment.

In the prewar period, this industrial branch existed virtually only in the USSR. It was built anew in other CEMA countries and, thanks to the large Soviet orders, it was immediately built on the basis of a planned division of labor in which even nonmaritime countries such as the Hungarian People's Republic and the CSSR participated. Multilateral production cooperation and specialization have been now organized in this technologically difficult industrial branch.

The CEMA countries' production specialization in the agricultural machine-building industry has reached significant proportions. The multilateral agreement on manufacturing of 252 types of machines has been in effect for more than 10 years.

Certain successes have been achieved in the production cooperation in the automobile industry. The shape of international production specialization is clearly manifested by Hungary which has concentrated on making omnibuses and a number of automobile assembly parts, and obtains all other types of automobiles from other CEMA countries. Multilateral production specialization and cooperation have been organized in the production of 37 standard-size automobile assembly parts and other automobile parts. Several CEMA countries

are also engaged in the large-scale manufacturing of assembly parts and other parts for the Soviet automobile Lada.

Production cooperation is rapidly developing in the electrical engineering industry. Altogether 746 specialized part numbers have been determined within the framework of the Interelektro organization.

The production specialization in manufacture of railroad freight and passenger cars has reached a considerable level already now. A multilateral agreement has made it possible to concentrate the manufacture of approximately 50 percent of standard-size freight cars in one or two countries.

All the aforementioned examples concern the traditional branches of the machine-building industry. But it is important to note that many of them have been established in a majority of CEMA countries only during the years of socialist construction.

It is characteristic that the degree of mutual division of labor is higher in those branches in which the shape of interstate production specialization and coordinated technical policy (for instance, in the shipbuilding industry) were clearly expressed from the very beginning. But wherever a branch was mainly organized to meet domestic demand and on the basis of autonomous technical policy (for instance, automobile manufacturing), the interstate production cooperation took hold only with difficulty. All this speaks in favor of arranging the production specialization of new branches and types of production in good time and in favor of the need to organize these branches and types of production on the basis of coordinated or even unified scientific-technical policy. Experience shows that this approach makes it possible to avoid parallelism and duplications in building new production capacities, in the scientific research and planning and design projects, in the search for sales markets.

Experience has been already gained in the development of deep forms of cooperation in the manufacture of essentially new technical equipment. Since the beginning of the 1970s, CEMA countries have developed a large-scale manufacture of electronic computers on the basis of an integrated technical policy. A multilateral agreement concerning new types of computer equipment was signed in 1980. Thanks to a high concentration of a number of specialized production operations in the individual countries, this agreement will ensure reciprocal deliveries for a total value of over 15 billion rubles in the current five-year plan period.

Interaction has grown rapidly and, from the very beginning, on a large scale in the atomic machine-building industry. This is dictated by the priority nature of nuclear power plants in the development of the contemporary energy basis. A program of cooperation in the fuel and raw materials and energy branches was adopted by CEMA countries in 1979 and this program envisages the construction of nuclear power plants with a total capacity of 30 million more kilowatts in the CEMA European countries (excluding USSR). A multilateral agreement on manufacturing equipment for nuclear power plants for the 1981-90 period was signed in the same year. The agreement joined together in a unified technological cycle more than 50 associations and enterprises of

fraternal countries. The manufacturing and reciprocal deliveries of equipment for nuclear power plants with 400-megawatt and 1,000-megawatt power generating units are the result of this complex coordinated activity.

Equipment for nuclear power plants had been manufactured virtually only by our country until only recently. And now, on the basis of the Soviet technical designs and plans and assistance, a wide range of nuclear equipment has become the common property of the community. And in this connection, the specific features of the existing industrial and scientific-technical structures have been taken into account in determining the type of specialization for any given country. Thus, the People's Republic of Bulgaria specializes in electrical engineering equipment and biological protection equipment, the Hungarian People's Republic specializes in high voltage instruments, the Polish People's Republic specializes in manufacturing steam generators, turbogenerators and several other types of equipment and so forth. The USSR manufactures a large variety of equipment under this program.

What conclusions can be made on the basis of the aforementioned examples?

First, in the development of scientific-technical and production cooperation the CEMA countries are capable of achieving and have already achieved considerable successes and are able to produce any type of complicated equipment.

Second, the systematic economic integration opens up enormous possibilities for jointly solving the biggest and most complicated production and technical tasks.

Third, it is expedient to begin the construction of a large branch or the mastering of a new type of production immediately with joint efforts by organizing the production specialization and cooperation along the entire reproduction cycle extending from the scientific-technical projects and coordination of capital investments and production programs to marketing of products as well as the organization of servicing activities.

Fourth, the dynamism and effectiveness of the development of selected directions of production specialization and cooperation are ensured in many respects by joint programs, close scientific-technical cooperation and collective operational management. Particularly instructive from this viewpoint are the manufacture of bearings and electrical engineering, the intrabranh cooperation in which is coordinated by multilateral organizations (the Organization of Cooperation in the Bearings Industry and the Interelektro organization), as well as the manufacture of computer equipment and atomic power equipment in which the development of cooperation is organized by intergovernment commissions.

The entire experience accumulated in the scientific-technical and production cooperation of CEMA countries in 3.5 decades represents collective property and is of an immense practical importance for achieving the goals set by the Economic Conference.

II

A most important result of that conference is that it has raised the coordination of economic policies of the fraternal countries to a new level and has worked out the strategic guidelines for their development for the period up to 2000.

By the beginning of the next century, the socialist community will have to move to qualitatively new frontiers of economic competition with the capitalist world, achieve a major advance in its scientific-technical and entire production base, ensure new social achievements and essentially raise the level of the people's welfare and culture. The process of gradually moving the levels of economic development of CEMA countries closer to one another and of leveling them will also have to be accelerated.

The serious aggravation of the international situation through the fault of imperialism forces the fraternal countries to take care of their economic and defense security. Under no circumstances will the socialist community allow the existing approximate military-strategic equilibrium between itself and NATO to be disrupted. It also will not allow any weakening of its technical-economic independence. On the contrary, this independence must be further strengthened in order to ensure a sufficient level of invulnerability to any form of economic aggression by imperialism.

The strategic goals of economic development of fraternal countries can only be achieved along the paths of deep and comprehensive intensification of production. Scientific-technical progress represents the basic link in this intensification. The role of scientific-technical progress as a factor of socialist expansion of reproduction and of solving the main socioeconomic tasks is objectively growing.

No major economic task can be solved now and in future without a massive and continuous introduction and utilization of new generations of highly productive technical equipment. Let us consider, for instance, the task of ensuring high rates of economic growth. Until recently this task was solved in many respects, if not mainly, by including additional labor and material resources in the economic turnover, by expanding the front of capital construction, by reclaiming new lands and by opening up new mineral deposits. Every percentage increase of industrial or agricultural production requires not a smaller and perhaps even greater corresponding of labor productivity because the numerical strength of labor resources drawn into material production shows a clearly expressed tendency of decline in the majority of CEMA countries. The same tendency is also apparent in relation to energy and primary raw materials. Increasing their production is by far not always economically justified because of the necessity of using less accessible and consequently more expensive natural resources. From the national economic viewpoint it is more profitable to invest funds in economizing of resources. And this, in its turn involves the mastering and mass production of resource saving technical equipment and technologies.

Thus, the interests of resource saving policy must be considered first and foremost both when allocating capital investments and when developing the

international socialist division of labor which, for the majority of CEMA countries, is becoming the main source of increasing their scientific-technical potential.

Here, it seems to us, it is necessary to define more precisely the concept of the scientific-technical potential of contemporary society. According to a current notion, the substance of the concept is determined primarily by scientific institutions and the numbers of their workers and it is the society's investments in this sphere that primarily ensure also the main economic effect. At times even plainly fantastic sums of this very conditional effect are cited, an effect which often has no effect on the state budget.

According to the Marxist-Leninist methodology, the entire economic effect (that is, the additional growth of national income) is created only in material production. Science, as a productive force, is only the first and by no means the final stage in the process of creating and realizing the economic effect. Scientific discoveries must be unfailingly converted into definite technical models and the latter must be taken over by the machine building and related branches for manufacturing in definite quantities and efficiently introduced into the national economy.

This understanding of the concept makes it possible to take fully into account the importance of the machine-building industry as a direct production source of scientific-technical progress because all new generations of machines and all progressive technical and technological systems--regardless of the branch or sphere (including science) in which they may be used--are produced and reproduced by the machine-building industry. Scientific-technical discoveries would remain unrealized and dead without the machine-building industry. Only rapid and mass manufacture of new highly productive generations of machines and equipment can transform the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution into a fundamental transformation of production itself and essentially accelerate the growth of social labor productivity. In our opinion, the viewpoint about the growth of the scientific-technical revolution into the scientific-production revolution and about an increasingly direct merging of science and production is interesting in this connection.

It is necessary here also to take into account the opposite links. It is not only the rates of technical progress of production but, in many instances, also the successes of fundamental science, the development of which is unthinkable without complicated equipment and instruments, that directly depend on the level of the machine building industry and its ability to produce the most advanced technical equipment.

It goes without saying the development of the machine industry has also qualitative and not only quantitative characteristics. In this connection we would like to emphasize that the scientific potential as a whole does not lend itself to a quantitative representation. In many respects--if not mainly--this is the creative potential of the individuals engaged in the scientific-production sphere. It is truly inexhaustible and at times capable of providing an unpredictable revolutionary transformation in science, technology and production.

The human factor plays an especially important role under the conditions of socialism. Labor liberated from exploitation opens up possibilities for a maximum utilization of the abilities of every individual. The goals of socialist production and its regulating methods and distribution principles also contribute to this. Socialist economic integration, too, plays a great role here. The returns from scientific-technical creativity increase many times over under conditions of international cooperation and mutual assistance.

Long-term planning and, in the sphere of international cooperation, joint planning activity, is a vital factor when combining the scientific-technological revolution with the advantages of socialism in practice. The advantages of socialism cannot be realized if scientific-technological progress develops in an uncontrolled way or on the basis of voluntarist decisions. Scientific-technological progress also cannot be solely within the competence of individual production units, because its main prerequisites are formed where branches overlap or even outside of production, and the mastering of many discoveries requires resources which considerably exceed the potentials of individual enterprises and sometimes even of entire branches. It must also be taken into account that the aggregate demands of all enterprises and all branches even for technical equipment that has already been introduced exceed the investment potentials of society for several five-year plan periods ahead. Hence the necessity for a close mutual connection between technological and structural policy and also for a scientifically substantiated distribution of capital investments, in time and in space, between branches and types of production. Proper consistency on the basis of a variable comparison of expected economic effectiveness not only in the context of the immediate future, but also of the long term, is now necessary as never before in the elaboration and introduction of technical achievements.

All this makes heightened demands on the planning of scientific-technological progress.

In this respect it is essential, first, to proceed from the fact that technological policy is now the main link in economic policy as a whole and, in the integration sphere, the main link in the coordination of economic policy. Scientific research and experimental design works and branches which formulate technical progress (primarily machine construction) cannot be overlooked in the distribution of capital investments and other resources. Otherwise the tasks of accelerating scientific-technological progress cannot become the basis for national economic planning.

Second, one must bear in mind the rising cost of mistakes or procrastination in the implementation of technical policy. The necessity is becoming more acute for a timely and correct choice of the main long-term directions of this policy on the basis of scientific forecasting and calculations of economic efficiency. Basic resources must be concentrated and set in motion in good time precisely in the selected priority directions of scientific-technological progress.

Third, accelerating the development of science and technology makes it necessary to ensure a rapid replacement of generations of machines and equipment, the constant mastering of fundamentally new types of products and the retraining of cadres. Hence arises the need for flexibility and operational efficiency in the regulating of scientific-technological progress. This attests to the expediency of periodically clarifying and constantly perfecting technological policy by proceeding from the latest scientific achievements and experience.

And in the sphere of cooperation between fraternal countries, the effectiveness of a coordinated scientific-technological policy can hardly be guaranteed now solely by traditional methods of coordinating five-year plans. The need for a general comprehensive programming of scientific-technological progress and for linking it more closely to production cooperation in priority aspects is making itself increasingly felt. Precisely such a program of action is called upon to become the starting point for national economic planning and plan coordination.

III

All these requirements, which emanate from the logic of production development in individual countries and in the socialist community as a whole, were the subject of discussion at the Economic Conference. Important decisions were unanimously adopted at this conference on working out ways on a collective basis of resolving major economic problems of mutual interest, and also aspects of direct cooperation in science, technology, production and capital construction. It is recorded in the Conference Statement: "Believing the comprehensive acceleration of scientific-technological progress to be particularly topical, the participants in the conference have agreed to jointly draw up on the basis of national programs a Comprehensive Program for Scientific-Technological Progress for the next 15-20 years as the basis for developing a coordinated and, in certain spheres, a unified scientific-technological policy for the purpose of resolving as rapidly as possible and through joint efforts the most important problems in the sphere of science and technology and introducing the results achieved into production in interested countries on mutually advantageous conditions."

The problems of drawing up such a program were discussed in detail by the highest representatives of the CEMA countries. Its practical, special-purpose direction was underlined, as well as the political importance of developing the main aspects of scientific-technological cooperation within the system of agreements on production cooperation. Precisely this kind of approach will ensure the effectiveness of joint programming and guard against reducing it to bare description or simple forecasting. This by no means lessens the importance of forecasts. There is no doubt that a joint program must absorb all the results of scientific-technological forecasting. Without this it is difficult to determine those main sectors for a breakthrough into the future on which the chief attention should be concentrated. Of course, in this respect one must take into account all international achievements, including the theory and practice of scientific-technological progress in developed capitalist countries.

The elaborations of scientists in socialist states and generalized world experience make it possible to determine the most important and long-term paths of progress in science, technology and production.

The great merit of the CEMA Economic Conference and the latest CEMA session held in Havana lies in their determination of the priority aspects which must form the basis of the Comprehensive Program for Scientific-Technological Progress in the CEMA countries up to the year 2000 and which, in fact, must also serve as the starting point and conceptual basis of long-term economic planning and plan coordination. The choice of priorities, now subject to consolidation in a collective program, is a major result of coordinating the economic policies of fraternal states.

The aspects determining the leading links in scientific-production cooperation between the CEMA countries are:

The electronization of the national economy on the basis of the extensive use of computing and microprocessing technology;

Comprehensive automation, including flexible automated production operations and automated planning systems;

The development of nuclear energy with the aim of broadly introducing it into the national economy not only for the processing of electric power, but also for the requirements of introducing heating systems;

The development and mastering of new materials (ceramic, polymeric and composite materials with set properties unique alloys, superpure metals and so forth) and new production and processing technologies (including new methods of founding, plasma processes, laser technology, powder metallurgy and so forth);

The development of achievements in biotechnology mainly for satisfying the needs of agriculture and medicine.

Precise, coordinated determination of a small range of chief priorities called upon to become the objects of production cooperation in the future will make the new comprehensive program an effective instrument in preplan work. It will become the concentrated expression of the coordinated scientific-technological policies of interested CEMA countries and the key to determining the main directions in which to develop production specialization and cooperation. In this respect the program will serve as a reliable guideline in plan coordination.

The implementation of this comprehensive program in all its chosen sectors will have exceptionally great strategic significance not only from an economic point of view, but also from a political one. It will make it possible for the CEMA countries to take up leading positions in the scientific-technological revolution, having liquidated any lagging which at present still exists in some sectors. Thanks to close cooperation, the fulfillment of this principled task will be vitally facilitated. Cooperation allows every country (and particularly small countries) to considerably enhance the effect of

utilizing their material and intellectual resources and to reduce the time taken to develop and introduce on a mass scale new generations of technical equipment and technology.

It is very important to cover all stages of scientific-technological progress: fundamental scientific research, scientific research and experimental design elaboration, the introduction of the best models into production, the organization of serial and mass production of new products on the basis of thorough production specialization and cooperation and the joint servicing of new technical equipment and technology.

It seems that the program's structure, which has already been coordinated in many ways at the present stage, fulfills the necessary requirements. It will consolidate the basic principles of the CEMA countries' long-term scientific-technological policy discussed at the conference and also their coordinated intentions in this sphere.

It is also proposed to reflect the priority aspects of cooperation between the interested countries through the whole innovation cycle--from fundamental research to the introduction and mastering of new technical equipment and technology. This will serve to ensure closer coordination between the activities of academies of sciences in fraternal countries and will also enhance their effect by concentrating on those problems the solution to which will have a decisive effect on production intensification. The fundamental research envisaged by the program will, as a rule, be directly connected with fulfilling the aforementioned aspects of cooperation in the sphere of a new technical equipment and technology. For example, the rapid and effective electronization of the national economy is, in many ways, determined by such branches of science as electronic data processing, microelectronics, computer mathematics and so forth. Elaboration of the theoretical bases for further developing electronics, and cybernetics and the problems of artificial intelligence in particular, will determine the ways of creating new generations of robots and flexible automated production operations.

It is no accident that the priorities of contemporary technological progress begin with electronics. It is precisely electronics that now exerts an ever increasing influence on literally all spheres and branches of production and also on many other aspects of social life. A radical increase in labor productivity, economy of all forms of resources and improvement in the quality of production is now inconceivable without the extensive introduction of electronics. The microprocessor is becoming no less a mass and universal element in all branches of machine construction than, for example, the bearing or the electric motor (according to some evaluations, the number of microprocessing systems and mechanisms will reach 10 million by the year 2000). Literally limitless possibilities are opening up in the future for using microprocessors as built-in control elements in industrial robots, machine and equipment systems, instruments, control systems and so forth.

While speaking of the possibilities for electronizing production, naturally one must not limit oneself purely to the technical side of the matter--one must also bear in mind its social consequences. Only under socialism will the mass introduction of computers not lead to unemployment and an increase in

social inequality in any of its manifestations. The results of the computer revolution will be utilized exclusively in the interests of the working people. Electronics will have a great influence on improving working and living conditions, developing the public education system, culture, public health care, environmental protection and so forth.

Of course, this entire complex of problems requires serious research. One cannot blindly copy capitalist practice. One must, in particular, develop the socialist concept of utilizing personal computers, the use of which under capitalism frequently assumes ugly forms. It is very important to more rapidly develop and coordinate the technical policy and nature of specialization of interested countries in the production of personal computers. It is easier to do this now, while they are being produced in thousands, rather than in millions, which one can expect in the not too distant future.

The nature of regulating the socialist economy is such that not one major economic or social problem can be successfully resolved if it is not reflected in good time in the national economic plan. Consequently it is particularly important to organically merge the course of implementing the comprehensive Program for Scientific-Technological Progress in the CEMA countries with coordination of their plans.

Obviously, long-term agreements on production specialization and cooperation in priority spheres of cooperation can serve as such connecting links. Currently effective multilateral agreements on cooperation in the production of equipment for nuclear power plants and on electronic computers are the prototype of such agreements. The obligations following from them are taken into account in the national economic plans of interested countries, and capital investments, resources, raw and other materials, and so forth, are allocated in good time for their realization.

Accumulated experience indicates that the process of drawing up a scientific-technological program and developing it within the system of agreements on production cooperation must be accompanied by cooperation between the central planning organs which are responsible for allocating basic resources. Obviously, the program must also be amended prior to the beginning of every five-year cycle. It is expedient for these processes to be of a joint program-special purpose planning nature not only covering science and technology, but also the subsequent stages of reproduction and also reciprocal trade.

The success of any affair depends on people--the main productive force of society. Today not yet all engineers and workers in fraternal countries are prepared to master the progressive achievements of microelectronics, robot technology, flexible automated systems, biotechnology and so forth. Consequently it is clear that any preplan and plan document determining a given aspect of intensification on the basis of higher technology must today also envisage preliminary and subsequent cadre supply.

As far as the most important problems are concerned, as it was noted at the Economic Conference, it is expedient to form international scientific-

technological centers along the lines of the United Institute for Nuclear Research in Dubno. The organization of such a center for the development of flexible automated production operations is already envisaged. The question of a joint scientific-technological association for robot technological complexes is being resolved between the USSR and the CSSR.

It is no doubt expedient to form joint organs for operational control and long-term planning in every priority sector, and, as experience is accumulated, international scientific-production associations with the functions of head organizations.

Of course, success in fulfilling the Comprehensive Program for Scientific-Technological Progress in the CEMA countries will depend on systematic fulfillment of the obligations emanating from it by the individual interested countries. An international program, as it is emphasized in the conference documents, must take national programs for developing science and technology into account. It would be useful if this tie were mutual and national programs fully considered and absorbed the coordinated propositions contained in the comprehensive program.

The task, supported by other fraternal parties, of turning the next five-year plan period into a period of intensive production and scientific-technical cooperation was put forward at the 26th CPSU Congress. At the Economic Conference this task was set, as a matter of fact, as one of paramount importance in the development of the integration process up to the year 2000. The role and specific proportion of production specialization and cooperation in the mutual cooperation between the CEMA countries will invariably increase. This is an objective requirement of the production intensification process and, consequently, of the intensification of the integration process itself. The extensive factors of the development of the integration process are already exhausted on the whole. Hence even the increase in the interbranch division of labor cannot be maintained at its previous high rates. A structural barrier, as it is now accepted to say, has arisen in the development of the international socialist division of labor. The essence of this barrier lies in the fact that the present interbranch structure of the division of labor between the CEMA countries no longer makes it possible to develop production cooperation and reciprocal commodity trade at rates exceeding the growth of national income. If measures are not taken to radically change the very structure of the division of labor in favor of internal branch specialization and cooperation, then the integration process could slow down and the role of reciprocal commodity trade in the CEMA countries' national income would diminish.

Consequently, the general concern of the fraternal countries is to comprehensively utilize their vast reserves of scientific-technical and production cooperation, particularly in new branches of production. World experience suggests that, in order to double machine-building production in countries with limited domestic market, international cooperation has to be increased 3-5 times on the basis of the production of parts and assembly parts. For the CEMA countries, the prospects of their economic growth and integration will depend to an increasing extent on the accelerated development of deep forms of labor division.

The decisions of the top-level Economic Conference of the CEMA Member Countries have determined the main directions and forms of this process. Regularly coordinating economic policy, concentrating efforts on the priority aspects of scientific-technical development, establishing direct links between associations, enterprises and organizations and setting up joint firms--all this is called upon to combine science, technology, production and international cooperation in a unified reproduction process. Any coordinated step in this direction will speed up the progress of each fraternal country and of the entire world socialist community as a whole.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

CSO: 1802/10

THE SOCIALIST COMMUNITY IN WORLD POLITICS

AU280501 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 85 (signed to press 27 Feb 85)
pp 104-115

[Article by N. Lebedev, doctor of historical sciences]

[Text] The new type of relations among the countries of the socialist community exert an ever increasing influence on international relations and in a number of spheres are forcing out the unjust, unequal forms and methods of interstate relations imposed by imperialism in the past.

Never before has it been so obvious that it is precisely the socialist community that is the leading force determining the main substance, main direction and main features of international development in the contemporary era. This new type of alliance which has formed on the basis of the principle of proletarian, socialist internationalism and which embodies the Leninist ideas of friendship and fraternity among peoples liberated from exploitation, has become a most important factor influencing the solution of all significant international problems of the contemporary era. It is precisely because of the consistently realistic, peace-loving policies of the countries belonging to the socialist community that Europe has lived in peace for almost 40 years. As it was noted at the top-level Economic Conference of the CEMA Member Countries held in Moscow last summer, socialism is capable of successfully resolving the most complex national and international problems. As a result of the selfless work of their peoples and thanks to their close cooperation in overcoming difficulties, the socialist countries have achieved outstanding results in the economy, culture, education and public health care, in establishing equality and friendship among nations and in creating favorable conditions for the individual to flourish. These successes are evidence of the vital force of the socialist system and of its superiority over capitalism.

The socialist community's constantly increasing influence on international affairs is ensured by its vast political, ideological, economic, military and scientific and cultural potential.

There is no issue of world politics in which the role and importance of the socialist community have become so strongly apparent as in the central problem of contemporary international life--the problem of war and peace, which is of

a clearly expressed class and political nature. It reflects the sharp conflict in the world arena between two diametrically opposed courses--socialist and imperialist.

There are no classes or social groups in the socialist countries that are interested in an arms race and military preparations, and certainly not in armed conflicts and aggressive actions. The struggle for peace is the honest and principled direction of their foreign policy. The thesis put forward by K. Marx in connection with the protests by French and German workers against the Franco-Prussian war is steadily given increasingly concrete substance in the mutual relations among the socialist states, this thesis being that: "...However the forthcoming loathsome war will end, the alliance between the workers of all countries will ultimately eradicate any wars. ...In opposition to the old society with its economic poverty and political insanity, a new society is coming into being, the international principle of which will be peace, because every people will have one and the same master--work" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 17, p 5).

The ideal of socialism is fraternal relations among peoples and states free of exploitation and imperialist oppression. "The bolsheviks," noted V. I. Lenin, "are creating totally different international relations that will make it possible for all oppressed nationalities to free themselves from imperialist oppression" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 42, p 107). Even before the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Lenin theoretically substantiated the fundamental principles of the foreign policy of the socialist state. In the fourth of his well-known "Letters from Abroad," which was devoted to a considerable extent to foreign policy issues, Lenin proposed that the Soviets state that they did not consider themselves bound by "any treaties either of the tsarist monarchy or of the bourgeois governments," that they immediately publish all these treaties, propose that "all warring powers immediately conclude a truce," and publish the worker-peasant conditions of peace: "the liberation of all colonies; the liberation of all dependent, oppressed peoples not enjoying full rights," the refusal to acknowledge the debts of the bourgeois governments which they had incurred as a result of waging "this criminal, plundering war," and so forth (op. cit., vol 31, p 53). Lenin also comprehensively elaborated the question of a nation's right to self-determination to the point of state separation, and in other critical respects, on the inevitability of an entire historical era "when socialist and capitalist states will exist alongside one another" (op. cit., vol 39, p 197), reflecting the necessity for peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems.

Soviet foreign policy has invariably been based and will continue to be based on the ideas and practical initiatives put forward by Lenin. The principles he developed of a foreign policy that is socialist by virtue of its class nature, consistently internationalist, genuinely democratic and profoundly peace-loving have honorably stood the test of time and given the land of the soviets great and permanent international prestige and the sympathy of all progressive mankind. By virtue of this fact they have also formed the basis of the international policy course followed by the countries of the socialist community.

The cooperation among the fraternal countries serves as an example of honest and genuinely comradely mutual relations, embraces the most diverse spheres of our peoples' life and serves the cause of socialist construction. The principle of socialist internationalism, which is pivotal to this interaction and cooperation, makes it possible to successfully overcome the difficulties encountered along the way and to combine the general interests of the community with the interests of each of the countries belonging to it.

The unity and cohesion of our peoples is built on a firm, objective, socioeconomic and ideological-political foundation--social ownership of production means; power belonging to the working people headed by the workers class and its political vanguard--communist and workers parties; and a common final goal of social development--the building of communist society. Thus, consolidating the cohesion of the countries of the socialist community is urgently dictated by the requirements of their social progress and by the necessity of fulfilling the similar tasks facing them. At the same time, this unity of aims and tasks by no means signifies some kind of standardized uniformity of the concrete means and methods of fulfilling these tasks or a leveling of those diverse conditions in which each member of the community implements progressive changes in the life of its people. The last 2 decades have enriched our ideas on the world of socialism and shown more clearly how varied and complex it is.

At this point it is important to dwell on one feature that has not only theoretical, but also practical significance. While creatively developing the legacy of Marxist-Leninist classics as applicable to contemporary conditions, our theoretical ideas not only recognize the diversity of the paths leading to socialism, but also a certain diversity in the concrete forms of its construction, which is explained by the specific features of the national conditions of a given country. At the same time, while characterizing the dialectical mutual connection between the general and the particular in this complex problem, it should be emphasized once again that the socialist system in a given country arises as a result of applying the basic principles of communism correctly modified with consideration of national and national-state differences. The negative attitude of Marxist-Leninists toward concepts of so-called "models of socialism" is by no means determined by the fact that these models emphasize these differences, but by the fact that they basically limit themselves by this emphasis, through conclusively leaving aside the issue of the essence of socialism and of those general laws of radical social transformations which emanate from scientific analysis of the collective experience of building real socialism. This methodologically faulty approach inevitably leads to making a nonclass appraisal of the phenomena of social and, in particular, international life, to aspiring to rise "above the struggle," to putting the countries of the socialist community and the imperialist powers on the same level, that is, basically rejecting Marxism and slipping down into the positions of bourgeois objectivism. Theoretically weak premises logically lead to politically harmful conclusions which essentially undermine the unity of the socialist countries and disintegrate the socialist community.

The harm of such concepts becomes all the more obvious if one considers that the consolidation of the fraternal countries of socialism has great

international significance, because the more united the socialist community--the stronger it will become in the face of imperialism's tireless attempts to slow down its development, halt the world revolutionary process as a whole, and preserve its domination in states liberated from colonial dependence. "The unity of the socialist states," notes Comrade K. U. Chernenko, "is a most important factor in contemporary conditions in the strengthening of peace on earth. At the same time, our unity is the prototype of the future fraternity between all working people, as well as socialism's contribution to the process of humanizing relations between peoples. Not a verbal contribution, but a real, tangible contribution."

During the 35 decades of the world socialist system's existence, considerable experience has been accumulated in forming and developing a new type of international relations and in combining the national-state interests of each socialist country with the international interests of the world of socialism as a whole. The international cooperation between the fraternal socialist countries clearly manifests itself as an important factor in developing their economy and culture, improving the people's well-being and strengthening their international positions. It should also be noted that, together with the flourishing of every socialist nation and the strengthening of its sovereignty, one can also observe the process of the gradual drawing together of the socialist countries, the leveling out of their standards of development and the intensification of mutual relations along both a party and a state line. Within the framework of the socialist community this process paves its own way as a law.

But, as experience has shown, all this does not come about of itself. The correct political line is necessary for these potentials to be implemented. The role of the ruling Marxist-Leninist parties in this exceptionally important matter lies in their taking into account the degree of maturity of socialism in every concretely given country and ensuring the most favorable conditions for developing the process of their drawing together, without rushing on ahead, but also without holding this process back.

History has proved that the strength and cohesion of the countries in our community, and their close cooperation in building socialism and pursuing a peace-loving policy are the main obstacle in the way of imperialist aspirations to world supremacy. The imperialists are well aware of this and try to discredit real socialism and to shake its unity in every way possible. Under the slogan of the Reagan "crusade" and resorting to the dirtiest methods, they have unleashed a campaign which bears all the features of political-ideological aggression.

In a situation where imperialism so openly gambles on deception, "psychological war," and blatant force in international relations, the struggle of the socialist states for democratic principles of international relations and for the preservation and strengthening of peace throughout the world acquires even greater significance. To this end the countries of the socialist community constantly put forward ideas and proposals aimed at strengthening peace and developing normal relations based on mutual respect and trust with all states, including those which belong to different social systems. In this the international policy of the socialist states

fundamentally differs from the foreign policy course of imperialism. Consistency and continuity, which have been manifest and continue to be manifest despite any turnabouts and changes in the international arena, are characteristic of the joint foreign policy actions and initiatives of the countries belonging to the socialist community. This principled foreign policy course adopted by the countries of the socialist community by no means lessens the significance of diplomatic skill, flexibility, initiative and information-propaganda support for their activities. On the contrary, precisely this provides a real opportunity to develop the aforementioned qualities of real socialism's international policies to the full. The peace programs put forward by the 24th, 25th and 26th CPSU congresses, which have been given active support by fraternal socialist countries, and the new peace initiatives worked out during the development of these programs, which the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact member countries have proposed in recent years serve as a graphic example of both continuity and consistency, as well as initiative, flexibility and offensiveness in the foreign policy activities of the socialist states. The putting forward of these peace programs and initiatives has signified a new, powerful peace offensive by world socialism.

Whichever important international forum we take as an example--be it the most recent UN General Assembly Session, the Stockholm conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe, or the January Geneva meeting between A. A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz--everywhere the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community show socialism's inflexible will for peace, demonstrate the constructive nature of socialist peace-loving policies and work for serious and honest dialogue together with strict observance of the principle of parity and equal security.

Our initiatives to prevent the militarization of outer space and to utilize it exclusively for the good of man, in defense of the peoples' right to themselves determine their own destiny, and against the policy of state terrorism have met with broad support in the United Nations. The participants in the 39th UN General Assembly Session were also witness to the intensive work conducted by other countries of the socialist community. Here are just some of the resolutions proposed by them at this authoritative forum: on the non-use of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war (jointly proposed by Hungary, the GDR and Cuba); on the peoples' right to peace (proposed by the Mongolian People's Republic); on strengthening the security of non-nuclear states (jointly proposed by Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia); on holding a Disarmament Action Week (the initiative of the CSSR and Mongolia); and on nuclear disarmament in all aspects (the GDR).

All the enumerated initiatives reflect the desire organically inherent in the socialist system to ensure peaceful conditions for its development, these conditions simultaneously being in the interests of the whole of mankind. And these initiatives are by no means dictated by current considerations or attempts to "outplay" the class enemy at the table of diplomatic debates, and certainly not by any weakness on the part of the socialist countries. "The Soviet people, like all fraternal peoples of the socialist countries," emphasizes Comrade K. U. Cherenko, "are vitally interested in lasting peace."

Preventing a new world war and lowering the temperature of the imperialist arms race in present-day conditions means preserving life on earth. The history of mankind has entrusted socialism with this difficult and exceptionally important mission. That is why we regard strengthening cooperation and interaction between the fraternal socialist states as the chief guarantee of successfully fulfilling all of our common aims."

Implementation of the socialist states' foreign policy programs, which are aimed at democratically restructuring the system of international relations, is taking place in the conditions of a frenzied class struggle in the world arena. Every step aimed at improving the international climate requires overcoming the opposition of the most reactionary and aggressive forces of imperialism, particularly U.S. imperialism. It is difficult to get rid of the impression that these circles intend to hurl mankind back to the times when interstate relations were guided by one law--the law of force, and, like King Louis XIV, to inscribe the Latin dictum "Ultima ratio regum" (The Final Argument of Kings) on the barrels of their guns. They openly attack the foundations of peaceful coexistence which, in the age of nuclear missile weapons and other latest mass destruction weapons, is the only reasonable, acceptable basis for developing relations between states with different social systems.

The feverish arms race being pursued by militarist circles with the aim of breaking the existing military-strategic balance in the world and gaining "power" superiority over the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole seriously threatens international stability and undermines its foundations. In order to justify their extremely dangerous, aggressive foreign policy course, reactionaries have unleashed an antisocialist propaganda campaign unprecedented in its scale, and real "ideological aggression" against the USSR and the fraternal countries of socialism. Leading representatives of the imperialist powers, and primarily leading U.S. statesmen, have actively joined this campaign and basically set its tone. The American President has repeatedly called for a new "campaign" against communism. "Psychological war" is being waged on the highest, one can say, hysterical, anti-Soviet, anticommunist note. "The enemy has embarked on downright brigandage on the air. We are dealing with attempts to organize real information-propaganda intervention against us and to turn radio and television channels into an instrument for interfering in the internal affairs of states and for conducting subversive actions," it was noted at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

Developing ideological aggression against the states of the socialist community, the bourgeois ideologues and politicians are setting themselves a complex task. They strive to distort the principled foundations of the international policy of socialism, falsify the concrete actions of the countries of the socialist community on the world scene, and exacerbate the international situation by means of slanders and by means of intimidation with the bugaboo of "communist threat." Anticommunism is the banner under which these forces unite and fight. Facing the challenge thrown to capitalism by the countries of the socialist community, the bourgeois propaganda shamelessly manipulates facts and strives to prove that all difficulties of capitalist society, that is, unemployment, economic crisis, inflationary processes,

unrestrained price increases, and the decline of the standard of living of population, are allegedly only temporary and accidental phenomena for the society of "general prosperity." At the same time, the bourgeois propaganda machine draws a distorted picture of the internal situation in the countries of socialism and strives to present matters in such a way as to show that it is precisely the socialist community that is the source of the threat to international peace and security as a result of which the working people of capitalist countries, they say, must further tighten their belts and the governments of these countries must reduce their expenditures for social needs in order to liquidate the military "lagging" of NATO behind the Warsaw Pact Organization. The claims about this mythical "lagging" are repeated daily by the bourgeois press, radio and television, that is, briefly, the cock-and-bull stories about the "aggressiveness" of socialist countries pour down on the head of the man in the street as if coming from a cornucopia. Various doctrines and concepts of "limited nuclear war," "protracted nuclear conflict," "first disarming strike," "preemptive or preventive strike," and other similar doctrines and concepts are widely discussed. This unbridled and irresponsible propaganda is aimed at thrusting militarist views upon peoples, breaking the opposition of the broadest strata of the population against the idea of nuclear war, and instilling in them the idea that such a war is "acceptable" and that it is therefore necessary to become reconciled with its prospects.

And at the same time, the bourgeois propaganda unscrupulously keeps silent about the consistent actions of the socialist countries for disarmament and for normalization of relations between all states. In recent years, the USSR has made more than 100 concrete proposals in the sphere of disarmament. It is precisely the USSR that has formally assumed the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against anyone. These facts are usually left "unnoticed" by the bourgeois manipulators of public opinion. But, as to compensate for that, their conjectures about a mythical "Soviet threat"--through and through false and perfidious--are not intended only for domestic "consumption" but are also splashed on the peoples of the liberated countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Imperialism also spares no resources for numerous ideological diversions against the socialist states, trying to "undermine socialism from within" and to create first an "opposition to the system" and then to transform it into a broadly developed antisocialist underground as happened in Poland.

Today, when the authority of real socialism in the international arena has immeasurably grown and the world of capitalism has entered a new period of serious crises, the ideological antagonism between them has become especially sharp and topical. The essence of the consistent peace-loving policy of the countries of the socialist community is to ensure that the feeling of reality and common sense will also prevail in the relations between the states with different social systems in the present situation. Communists have always been against turning the controversy of ideas into a confrontation between states and peoples, and against weapons and the readiness to resort to them becoming a criterion of the potential of social systems.

Socialism has set and is successfully solving--for the first time in the history of mankind--the task of achieving a complete equality of all peoples and states in international relations. The Leninist thesis formulated as early as during the period of preparations for the Genoa conference is demonstrating its vital force: This is the thesis that all peoples, big and small, should participate in world politics on an equal footing and that no interference in their internal affairs should be allowed (op cit., vol 45, p 36). The consistent course of the USSR and other countries of socialism in defending this "international scheme" has decisively contributed to the fact that the liberated countries have come to see the socialist community as their natural ally and loyal partner in the anti-imperialist struggle. It goes without saying that the mutual relations between the socialist and liberated states should not be seen as some kind of an idyll and that the problems that at times arise between them as a result of essential differences in the nature of social structures and of a heavy colonial heritage, as well as a result of the massive ideological, economic, political and military pressures exercised against them by imperialism should not be ignored. The objective trend of a rapprochement between the positions of world socialism and liberation movements is furthered precisely through these difficulties.

This positive process is based on a number of factors. The countries of the socialist community are providing comprehensive and selfless assistance to and support for the young independent states. Precisely this cooperation with the USSR and other fraternal socialist countries has enabled to an enormous extent the young states to become equal subjective factors in international relations. The true internationalist foreign policy of the countries of socialism helps them defend their political interests in the international arena. The role of these countries in international life will undoubtedly continue to grow. Suffice it to say that about 130 of the 159 UN member-states belong to the group of "developing" countries and that more than two-thirds of the earth's population in fact lives in these countries.

It is natural that the independent countries, which often share a common anti-imperialist position with the countries of the socialist community, should play an important role in forming a system of international political and economic relations on the basis of general democratic principles. Asian, African and Latin American countries are intensifying their activities and initiatives in the direction of a radical restructuring of international economic relations on just and democratic foundations. It is known that, in recent decades, the colossal gap in the level of economic development between former colonies and their metropolises not only has not been narrowed but, on the contrary, has grown wider. The bourgeois economic literature attributes this phenomenon to the "egoism of rich nations" who refuse to earmark sufficient resources to poor nations in the form of "aid." Of course, this approach merely camouflages the past plundering of colonies by the imperialist West and represents an attempt to shed responsibility for the exploitation of the poor nations' raw materials, fuel and human resources which continues even now. This superficially seemingly apolitical concept also has a hidden social meaning: the rubric "rich nations" includes also the socialist countries that have no historical responsibility for the backwardness of Asian, African and Latin American peoples because they have not participated in the past and do not participate now in the plundering of these peoples. Moreover, it is

precisely the countries of socialism that are doing everything in their power to promote the economic formation of the young states.

Our planned economy and foreign trade act as stabilizers for the export markets of a whole number of these states, especially in the periods of economic crises. CEMA also represents for them an important alternative source of resources, machines and technology, and strengthens their competitiveness in the face of greedy Western monopolies. The economic relations between the socialist states and liberated countries in fact represent an essentially new type of economic relations in the contemporary world. The just and equal norms of trade and economic relations between them are winning increasingly greater international recognition and are squeezing out the most odious neocolonialist practices, and they serve as an obvious prototype for many collective trade and economic demands of the young states, which they defend in the international arena together with the countries of the socialist community.

It was noted at the Economic Conference of CEMA Member States in Moscow last summer that the socialist countries "resolutely condemn and reject the course aimed at undermining the peaceful foundations of international relations and oppose all forms of exploitation and all attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries and to use economic ties as an instrument of political pressure, considering all this as the grossest violations of universally recognized norms of international law and of the principles of the UN Charter and the CSCE Final Act."

This political and moral support has been confirmed by important concrete acts. The countries of the socialist community have concluded long-term intergovernmental trade and economic and scientific-technical cooperation agreements with 80 Asian, African and Latin American states, something that enables the partners involved to plan their economic relations. Cooperation with world socialism promotes the construction of enterprises in the key branches of the national economy and helps the young states resist the imperialist pressures. The number of the projects built in cooperation with the socialist countries has now reached 5,000.

A break with the capitalist system--as has been done by Mongolia, the DPRK, Cuba and SRV, and Laos--undoubtedly represents the most radical way of ensuring genuine economic autonomy. A socialist orientation, that is, the choice of a noncapitalist road, also opens up real prospects for building the foundations of an autonomous economy. The production relations here have already been cleansed in many respects of the inheritance of exploitative formations, and the revolutionary democratic parties, expressing the interests of the broadest working masses, act here as promoters of progressive changes. These parties have established firm ties with the socialist community and with the ruling communist and workers parties and have erected a barrier against any transplantation of the capitalist structure from outside. All this opens up the scope for and provides impulse for economic growth and, although the countries of socialist orientation do have their multifaceted problems that are not simple, the fruits of this growth are enjoyed by the entire working population.

The existence of the aforementioned group of countries among the liberated states, that is, the group of states representing the vanguard of the contemporary stage of the national liberation movement, together with the impact of real socialism on world development, undoubtedly influences the radicalization of the slogans and methods of economic decolonization and intensifies the consistently anti-imperialist elements in its contents. The same can also be said about the joint struggle of the socialist and liberated states against the information imperialism, the struggle that is instrumental in overcoming the cultural, propaganda and ideological dominance of the former metropolises in Asian, African and Latin American countries. It is appropriate to point out in this connection that the very appearance of the phenomenon of socialist orientation has been possible only thanks to the existence of real socialism.

The foreign policy and foreign economic strategy of world socialism in relation to the liberated states proceeds from the class interests of the proletariat and the working people of the entire world. Today the mutual relations between the socialist and liberated states are of a diverse nature and extend beyond the framework of economic, trade, cultural and scientific-technical contacts and assistance and political and military support. World socialism has demonstrated on more than one occasion that it is a natural ally of all those who struggle for the elimination of discrimination and exclusion of all exploitation from international relations and against the use of economic levers as a means of political pressure and interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states.

The experience of the USSR and other countries of the socialist community in an accelerated development of productive forces on the basis of social ownership of the means of production has also become the common property of the national liberation movements. In applying this experience by taking into account the conditions of their own countries, the progressive forces of the young states find the possibility to significantly accelerate the rates of socioeconomic development and ensure that this development will be in accord with their national interests and will raise the standard of living of the broad working strata of the population and not that of the top exploitative leadership. The practice of the liberated countries convincingly proves that it is precisely along this road that they are achieving successes in the social and political spheres, giving a resolute rebuff to neocolonialism, and strengthening their national independence and sovereignty.

The bourgeois ideologues are compelled to admit that the force of attraction of the example of the USSR and other socialist countries in solving the basic problems of social development is gaining in strength in the liberated countries. American sociologist I. Horowitz explains this by the fact that the socialist revolution in Russia, carried out under "backward economic conditions," enabled the country to achieve enormous economic progress within a short period. Dzh. Dzhuks [name as transliterated], former member of the British Foreign office, states in his book "Soviet Union and Asia" that the USSR has strengthened its authority even in those Asian states that had been formerly "opponents of socialism." He admits that this is a "result of the example" of a sharp rise in the welfare, economy, science and culture in the USSR's Central Asia republics that provide an "illustration of what can be

achieved," and achieved without the participation of the "private enterprise sector." At the same time, the apologists of capitalism persistently claim--without providing any proof--that the experience of world socialism is "unacceptable" for the liberated states. They direct their efforts toward isolating these states from the world of socialism, their natural ally in the anti-imperialist struggle.

However, neither the massive imperialist propaganda nor the fabrications of some reactionary, pro-Western, or politically shortsighted figures in the liberated states themselves can deprive real socialism of its magnetic force and conceal from the peoples who have discarded the colonial ways the fact that the very existence of the countries of the socialist community and its moral and material support have played and continue to play a most important role in their defense of political independence and economic autonomy by forcing the imperialist states to refrain from the most aggressive methods and means in the conduct of their foreign policy in relation to the Asian, African and Latin American countries. In extending their financial, economic, scientific-technical and information and cultural assistance to the peoples of former colonies, the states of the socialist community do not pursue any mercenary goals, and strictly adhere to the principles of noninterference in the internal affairs of other states and respect for national sovereignty, and do not participate in the profits from the enterprises built with their assistance.

The community of fundamental social interests of the young independent states and the countries of socialism on the world scene represents a solid basis of their anti-imperialist alliance and of their joint struggle for peace and general security. The liberated countries are able to convince themselves with their own eyes by the example of their own development that the Soviet Union and other countries of socialism are their loyal allies in the struggle against neocolonialism and for establishing just economic relations in the world, the relations that will further to the fullest extent their social and cultural progress.

Life refutes the inventions and destroys the vain hopes of those who dream about breaking up the alliance between the world socialism and the national liberation movement. The ties of solidarity linking the USSR and other countries of the socialist community with the forces struggling against neocolonialism and the imperialist policy of oppression and diktat are growing firmer and firmer from year to year. The course of world socialism toward alliance with the national liberation movement and with the peoples and states that have found their independence, is not a temporary tactical policy, but a natural demand of social forces in the struggle for social progress.

The constructive foreign policy line of the countries of the socialist community on the world scene which is aimed first and foremost at preserving peace, strengthening international security, preventing the militarization of outer space and eliminating the threat of a world nuclear catastrophe, draws sympathies to these countries and evokes the active assistance of the entire progressive world public, the vanguard of which are the communist and workers parties. The struggle for mankind's peaceful future unites the ranks of the international communist movement. The threat of nuclear war hanging over the

world provides the incentive for assessing anew the basic purpose of the movement's activity. Communists have been always fighters against oppression and exploitation of man by man but today they struggle also for the preservation of human civilization and for the right of man to life, it was noted at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Real socialism is a source of inspiration, and the foreign policy of the countries of the socialist community is a source of mighty, practical support for the international communist movement. The experience of the USSR and other fraternal countries of socialism helps the communists of the entire world solve the problems they face; that is, naturally, if this experience is correctly interpreted and creatively absorbed and not falsified or mechanically copied.

The development of international events in recent months has again confirmed the correctness of the peace-loving foreign policy of the states of the socialist community. This principled course is not influenced by any considerations dictated by current circumstances or by any transitory and momentary considerations. Safeguarding peace and the right of peoples to independence and social progress, to peaceful coexistence, fruitful cooperation and disarmament is not a hollow propaganda slogan, but a subject of constant concern and an invariable goal of the socialist countries. This was once again convincingly demonstrated in Geneva in January this year. Having heard Comrade A. A. Gromyko's report on his meeting with G. Shultz, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo at its session expressed a unanimous view of the importance of the achieved agreement concerning the subjects and goals of the Soviet-American negotiations on the questions of space and nuclear weapons that will be considered and solved in their mutual relationship. These peaceful initiatives of our country represent a new weighty contribution to the general efforts of the entire socialist community to avert the nuclear danger.

At the same time, the peace-loving policy of the countries of the socialist community is a policy of firm and resolute rebuff to the aggressive aspirations of imperialism and to any encroachments upon the security of the USSR and its allies. The states of the socialist community have at their disposal everything they need to defend their historical revolutionary achievements. "The world of socialism reliably stands up against the intensified attacks of the imperialist reaction," Comrade K. U. Chernenko says. "Unfortunately, our class enemies can still cause trouble for us and, at times, quite big trouble. But they cannot seriously brake our advance and, even less, can they press out [potesnit] world socialism. The current of the new life and the historical advance of socialism are gathering force and confidently sweep away all barriers from their path."

The two social systems now stand as two poles in world politics, as two opposite sides of the basic contradiction of the contemporary period which determines the course of world history. Competition between them is inevitable, including competition in the international political sphere and therefore the elements of their cooperation are dialectically combined and interwoven with the elements of antagonism. Cooperation and struggle stand as the most important qualitative characteristics of peaceful coexistence, as two branches of a single phenomenon. Their unity has a dialectical character, it

is impossible to isolate them from each other, to accept one of its aspects and to reject the other one. The international relations of the past decade convincingly confirm this dialectic.

Peaceful coexistence does not imply a liquidation of the basic contradiction between socialism and capitalism and of their class struggle, it does not eliminate their social and ideological differences and their fundamental character, and it does not abolish the need for radical social changes in the contemporary world. It includes the sphere of interstate relations but, naturally, does not extend to the sphere of ideological, social and inter-class relations.

But, at the same time, the Marxist-Leninists' recognition of the inevitability of antagonism under the conditions of contemporary international relations does not imply that they supposedly advocate every kind of struggle between states, every struggle in any form and with any methods. What is involved are only those forms of the struggle which do not undermine peaceful relations between states. Proceeding from these positions, the Marxist-Leninists resolutely condemn the current aggressive actions of imperialism because they are incompatible with peaceful coexistence in which the superiority of one or another system is not verified and determined by the crossing of arms or by the rate of preparation for an armed engagement, but by competition in the economic, political, social and spiritual spheres, in the sphere of fulfilling the hopes and strivings of popular masses, in the sphere of improvement of their life, in the sphere of establishing social justice, and in the sphere of genuinely ensuring all human rights and freedoms. "It is a great boon for the cause of peace and international security that there exists in the world the community of socialist states that consistently defends the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence in the international arena," K. U. Chernenko emphasized in his speech at the election meeting of working peoples. The socialist countries advocate cooperation between all states on the basis of equality as well as the preservation of peace and of the very civilization on earth from the threat of nuclear annihilation hanging over it.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985.

CSO: 1802/10

WORLD OF CAPITALISM UNDER THE BURDEN OF DEBTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 85 (signed to press 27 Feb 85) pp 116-127

[Article by Prof N. Shmelev, doctor of economic sciences]

[Text] Some new destructive trends previously unknown to the capitalist world were noted in the global capitalist economy in the 1970s and 1980s. Its economy is developed today from one crisis to another and the emergence from the latest crisis--whether usual and cyclical or long and structural--requires increasing stress of forces and the harnessing of all reserves still at the disposal of capitalism.

The universal crisis of indebtedness, which spread over the national economies of many capitalist countries and the international monetary sphere of capitalism as a whole in the 1980s, was one such new phenomenon. It would be no exaggeration to say that whereas in the 1970s the gravest problem of international economic life was the new petroleum price, in the 1980s the huge pyramid of debts hanging over the world capitalist economy assumed a similar importance. Should this pyramid collapse in the final account, the American journal FOREIGN POLICY warns, the entire capitalist world "would plunge into an economic crisis for a decade or even longer." No single economic problem is now drawing so much attention as anything related to the debts: state budget deficits, the payment situation of countries and corporations, international capital transfers, the resources of commercial banks and international financial institutions, the level of interest rates, the exchange rates of main currencies, etc. Politicians, bankers, economists and journalists are all discussing today the possibility of restoring a balance in the monetary sphere of capitalism, emphasizing, above all, the international nature of the problem.

Credit and, respectively various forms of indebtedness incurred by corporations, consumers and financial and governmental institutions are an inseparable organic part of the capitalist reproduction process, and the higher the socialization of production and labor under capitalism becomes, the more developed and all-embracing becomes its credit system. The basic economic function of capitalist credit is to harness for production purposes temporarily liquid funds of companies and private citizens' savings, i.e., all kinds of monetary accumulations which have remained, for one reason or

another, outside the area of circulation of productive capital. As capitalism develops and as the scale of reproduction grows, the objective possibilities of credit expand as well. Capitalist credit has long exceeded national frameworks: today it is already a question of the merger of national with international financial markets and the transformation of the crediting system into a truly cosmopolitan instrument for the accumulation of available resources and their redistribution among different sectors and countries on the scale of the entire nonsocialist world.

However, although it expands production possibilities, credit also increases the gravity of contradictions within the capitalist economy, its disproportionality and its inherent uncontrolled trends which are manifested in periodically recurring crises. As K. Marx wrote, "Credit accelerates material production forces and creates a world market; expanding them as the material foundations of the new production method to a certain high level of development is precisely the historical task of the capitalist production method. At the same time, credit accelerates the violent upheavals of such contradiction and crises, thus intensifying the elements of breakdown of the old production methods" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 25, part I, pp 484-485).

Credit is the most powerful instrument for economic upsurge. However, thanks to the uncontrolled nature of the capitalist market, the gambling of successful investors and the speculative aspirations of financiers, inevitable under capitalism, it remains the weakest, the most brittle link in the entire economic mechanism. It is precisely with credit that an overall economic decline usually begins (as in the mountains, when the fall of a single stone may create a gigantic landslide). Not the least reason for this is the fact that a break in one of the links of the financial chain leads to a multiple increase in the series of subsequent breaks: in the United States, for example, today a dollar invested in a bank is then loaned along the entire chain of financial institutions no less than six times until it reaches the stage of its final use. "It is precisely the tremendous development of the credit system during a period of prosperity, as well as the tremendous increase in demand for borrowed capital and its permanent availability during such periods that create credit difficulties during stagnation periods," Marx emphasized (ibid., p 494).

Under the conditions of a developed credit system, the insolvency of one--a government, bank, company or individual borrower who took a loan to build a house--means not only an isolated failure but a drastic worsening of the liquidity position and, at the same time, the collapse of the creditor and the creditor of the creditor and the creditor of the two preceding creditors, etc. Now, when the economic interdependence among all capitalist countries has increased so greatly, this potential possibility of a break in the financial chain becomes not only a national but a major international threat. Bankruptcy, i.e., the failure of any industrial company, bank or governmental institution, let us say in Brazil, may have as its end result the collapse of a U.S. bank or the loss of capital of an Arab country which has invested its available cash in the European currency market and subsequently, through one of the multinational banks, made a loan to Brazil, or else tangible losses may

be suffered by an entire group of international creditors united in a banking consortium, or even all such combined consequences may take place.

The pyramid of debts in the capitalist world has today acquired fantastic proportions, exceeding the total gross national product of all capitalist countries combined. A more or less accurate idea of the scale of indebtedness is provided by the sum of bank assets, which is close to \$12 trillion. Some \$10 trillion of that is the internal indebtedness of the capitalist countries, and approximately \$2.25 trillion is international assets of banks or international indebtedness (it is worth noting that the capital of all banks in the capitalist world combined totals \$0.6 trillion. "Global indebtedness," i.e., the internal and external indebtedness of the capitalist countries rose by an average of 15 percent annually in the 1970s and 1980s, or several hundred percent faster than the GNP in the capitalist world. "Living on loans" became a more than usual phenomenon; it became one of the most characteristic and, let us add, most explosive features of the contemporary capitalist economy on all levels--state, corporate, petty entrepreneurial, and others, including individual consumers.

Naturally, from the strictly economic viewpoint a significant percentage of this pyramid of debts is fictitious. The productive utilization of credit is merely the final link in a long chain of financial relations covering a number of creditors and debtors, sometimes with no ties to production whatsoever, but only earning income from the same repeatedly loaned funds. However, even this incredibly inflated credit circulation is merely part of the problem. Closely related to it are purely speculative operations in the monetary area, the sole purpose of which is the transfer of money from hand to hand with a view to obtaining speculative profits for some, the successful ones, at the expense of losses suffered by those who are unsuccessful. The turnover on the New York Stock Exchange alone, for example, reached the astronomical sum of \$50 trillion in 1983. For comparison's sake let us recall that the entire GNP of the United States that year equaled approximately \$3 trillion and that the entire real turnover in international trade was slightly under \$2 trillion.

This absurd and illusory world of gigantic speculations quite emphatically reflects the growth of parasitical trends in contemporary capitalism. Most such money is nothing but thin air. Nevertheless, its dynamics has a very strong and, sometimes, even decisive impact on the entire economic life of the leading bourgeois countries and the entire global capitalist economy.

The role of credit in ensuring the expanded reproduction process in the leading capitalist countries rose steadily in the 1970s. Conditions on the capital lending market favored this: because of a galloping inflation, bank interest rates could not catch up with currency devaluations and interest rates on the credit market were frequently even negative. Between 1974 and 1978, for example, real annual interest rates on the European currency market (nominal percentage excluding the pace of price increases) were minus 5-7 percent. Naturally, this encouraged industrial corporations and individual consumers to borrow money, particularly on a short-term basis.

Whereas in the mid-1950s, according to THE ECONOMIST, the assets of American nonfinancial companies consisted of 33 percent of borrowed funds and 67 percent of stockholders' capital, at the beginning of the 1980s the ratio was roughly 57 to 43. The share of the "hottest" short-term indebtedness increased significantly as well: at the beginning of the 1950s, such indebtedness incurred by American companies (repayable in under 1 year) did not exceed 33 percent of their long-term indebtedness; by the end of 1982, the ratio had reached 100 percent. The role of consumer credit has intensified as well. The mass consumer in the West is sinking deeper and deeper into the mire of indebtedness; in the United States, for example, between 1970 and 1982 outstanding consumer loans increased from \$143 to \$410 billion.

We believe, however, that the most important and far-reaching changes in the internal credit system of the main capitalist countries are to be found not only in these more or less natural economic processes but in the fact that credit has become today the most important political instrument of the capitalist state and an effective tool for supporting the political course and political interests of the most reactionary segment of the ruling class, in the United States, the leading capitalist country, above all. Under the Reagan administration, a phenomenon unparalleled in peacetime has taken place: the state has actually pushed out of the domestic credit market the private borrower, whether industrial corporation or individual consumer. In recent years, federal government borrowing has accounted for about 70 percent of all private savings in the United States or, in other words, more than two-thirds of all available national savings in the United States are used today to meet the needs of the state and only under one-third, mostly theoretically at that, goes into production use, including new capital construction and updating the production potential in civilian sectors.

Neither the American credit system nor the entire American economy have ever been subjected to such a deliberately orchestrated governmental pressure. What is its purpose and, most importantly, who does it benefit? The answers to such questions should be sought less in the realm of economics than in politics and, above all, in the nature of the current foreign policy course of the U.S. government. The unrestrained arms race unleashed by the Reagan administration in its desire to disrupt the current global balance of forces and attain military superiority by the United States, costs huge amounts of money and cannot be achieved only with customary and normal financial means, i.e., taxation. Two ways were open to Washington: either the printing press, i.e., further increase in inflation, the nightmare of the U.S. economy of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s, or deficit financing, i.e., covering increasing military expenditures by increasing the state indebtedness. The White House chose the latter.

In the 4 years since Reagan became president, the U.S. national debt rose to \$1.6 trillion. Today's U.S. administration has borrowed more than the American treasury has borrowed since the country was founded. By 1986 the national debt may exceed \$2 trillion. The reason for such a fast increase is the headlong growth of the budget deficit, despite Reagan's sworn assertions that one of the main purposes of his administration will be to balance the budget. The U.S. budget deficit rose from \$68.7 billion in 1980 to \$194.7 billion in 1983. In turn, this was the consequence of only two factors (since

budget revenue, despite a certain tax reduction, also increased, compared with 1980, while expenditures for some social needs were either cut or kept on their previous level): first, the excessive growth of military expenditures, which have been increasing by 11 to 15 percent annually in recent years, reaching \$300 billion for the 1985 fiscal year; second, as in the legend of the white bull, the increased interest which the American treasury must pay its lenders on funds borrowed to cover that same budget deficit.

We must point out that the trend of a fast growth of the national debt is inherent not only in the United States but in most other leading capitalist countries. Between 1973 and 1983, the national debt-to-GNP ratio increased from 42.5 to 48.2 percent in the United States, from 18.6 to 41.6 percent in the FRG, from 16.9 to 24.2 percent in France and from 60.6 to 80.7 in Italy. Despite differences among these countries, one could say that the main reason for the increased national debt in most Western countries is one and the same--the ever-increasing burden of military expenditures, which can no longer be financed directly and, therefore, which must be passed on to the future generations.

This burden of indebtedness is having today a drastically negative influence on possibilities of normal economic growth in the leading capitalist countries. In the United States, for example, the hindering role played by the debt is manifested in a number of areas. To begin with, the "normal" indebtedness of industrial companies, which increased noticeably, led to the fact that now they assign not 10 percent, as in the 1950s, but about 50 percent of their profits and amortization withholdings to repaying and servicing their short-term and long-term obligations. Naturally, this lowers their investment possibilities. Secondly, thanks to its superior financial power, in order to force the other borrowers off the market, for the past several years the state has artificially maintained an unparalleled high level of interest rates on borrowed funds. Combined with the solid reputation enjoyed by government securities, this level is the principal means which allows the federal government to "extract" loan capital from the domestic credit market. According to specialists, as a result of budget deficits and an abnormal borrowing activity by the state, U.S. interest rates are approximately one-third higher than they would have been in the opposite case (i.e., by more than 4 percent of the current 12-13 percent interest rate). Meanwhile, confident that the national debt cannot increase indefinitely (everything has its limits) and that sooner or later the government will be forced once again to resort to the printing press to finance its expenditures, bankers are already hastening to insure themselves from future losses which will be caused by the inevitable inflation as a result of the incredibly high interest rates charged on their loans. Naturally, the high interest rates frighten many potential borrowers in the production area. Thirdly, and finally, the industrial companies find it unprofitable under the present circumstances to invest their available funds into new capital construction, for it is far more profitable to lend them to the banks at a high interest rate and, through the banks, to the government, thus earning higher profits without any difficulty, compared to expanding or updating production facilities.

All of this drastically reduces the possibilities of industrial companies to use their own and borrowed funds for investment purposes: that is why internal industrial investments in the United States have been declining in recent years in real terms. The volume of capital investments for the construction of industrial enterprises dropped by 24 percent in 1983 and exceeded the precrisis level only in 1984. "Unless we find a political formula for drastic budget cuts," noted the FAR EASTERN ECONOMIC REVIEW, "deficits would absorb virtually all American private accumulations for the rest of the decade, in addition to seriously damaging investments."

The natural question which arises is, how could the Reagan administration undertake such a deliberate bleeding of the economy of its own country? In fact, things are not so simple: this entire policy is pursued more to someone else's benefit than to one's own. Essentially, it is a question of the fact that in manipulating interest rates the administration in Washington has found a very convenient method, in the short term at least, to shift to other shoulders, i.e., to the shoulders of other countries, some of its military expenditures while, at the same time satisfy a significant percentage of U.S. needs for new capital investments. Such an extensive and shameless use of other countries' capital to finance one's adventuristic and hegemonistic foreign policy and economic growth is a relatively new phenomenon in the history of American imperialism.

The mechanism of such massive drawing on the resources of other countries by the United States is based almost entirely on the artificially high interest rates and, as a consequence, the artificially inflated value of the dollar (by 35 to 40 percent). During the 1980s, foreign investors found it more profitable by 2-4 percent per annum (and for investors from some countries by an even higher percentage) to keep their money in the United States than at home. At the same time, the possibility of earning speculative profits from the purchase of dollars, the price of which increased with every passing day, attracted and is still attracting to the United States a mass of "hot" money consisting of short-term deposits. This system operates like a powerful pump which siphons off available funds from other countries and invests them in the American economy.

The influx of direct and portfolio foreign investments, short- and long-term capital and speculative money in solid capital investments is actively "digested" and transformed by the American financial system. Part of this capital is used to finance the U.S. national debt (today more than 15 percent of it is owned to foreigners); another share is used to finance the variety of economic requirements of that country. At the same time, the influx of foreign capital worsens the major problems affecting the American economy: a huge deficit in the balance of payments, which amounted to \$120 billion in 1984, a large balance of payment deficit for current operations, on the level of \$90 billion that same year, gigantic budget deficits and the incredible size of the national debt, a low level of productive use of national savings, etc.

At the beginning of the 1980s, the annual influx of capital in the United States was \$40-50 billion; it reached \$100 billion in 1984. "Today's American prosperity," the American journal NEWSWEEK noted, "depends to a considerable

extent on the good will of foreigners." M. Feldstein, the former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to the U.S. President, said that in 1984 foreign capital investments should account for one-half of all new internal capital investments in the United States. P. Volcker, chairman of the U.S. Federal Reserve Bank (which is essentially the country's central bank) was forced to make the following typical admission to Congress: "Today the largest and richest economy in the world is on the verge of becoming an international debtor and, soon, even the biggest debtor." Reality proves the accuracy of this statement: in 1983 U.S. foreign assets totaled \$834 billion, while assets owned by foreigners in the United States amounted to \$711 billion. In other words, should the present trend continue, by 1985 the United States will inevitably become a large international debtor, for the sum total of all foreign investments in the United States will exceed the sum total of all U.S. capital investments abroad.

For the time being, this unique method of resolving one's problems at someone else's expense is working (although its obvious costs are the worsened competitiveness of American exports and the loss of approximately 1.3 million jobs as a result of their relative reduction). It is working despite the fierce objections of the governments of other capitalist countries, including the closest U.S. allies, who are deprived of tens and hundreds of billions in national savings as a result of the predatory and self-seeking policy of the Reagan administration. Furthermore, according to the forecasts of most specialists, there is no hope whatsoever that for the rest of this decade interest rates in the United States will drop and that such an "international blood-letting" will come to an end.

However, one cannot fail to see that neither the American economy nor international economic relations can develop on such an unhealthy basis in the long term. A time will inevitably come when neither U.S. domestic credit resources nor even the savings of the entire capitalist world will suffice to finance the American national debt. The danger of the current adventuristic course is being felt increasingly in the United States itself. This is confirmed, in particular, by frequent opposition to the further increase in the national debt. It is equally obvious that the patience and financial resources of the rest of the capitalist world are not infinite. Sooner or later, either the interest rates or the exchange rate of the dollar, or both, will drop, at which point the mass outflow of capital from the United States will begin. The current Washington administration, however, is apparently firmly supporting the notorious historical principle of "after us the deluge." Reagan is remaining true to himself: if the world financed U.S. economic development in the 19th century, why not do it today as well, in the 2 final decades of the 20th?

The unparalleled increase of international indebtedness is another most important aspect of the contemporary indebtedness crisis. The bulk of it (about two-thirds) is caused by loans to state institutions in developed capitalist countries and leading multinational corporations, and turnover among banks. However, the most dangerous feature in terms of international monetary stability is that third of international debts consisting of loans to governments of developing countries, obtained from the governments of other countries or multinational commercial banks operating primarily on the

European currency market. The total indebtedness of the developing countries had reached \$1 trillion in 1984. A small group of the largest countries in Latin America, several so-called "new industrial" countries in Southeast Asia and even some OPEC members account for most of the indebtedness. More than 60 percent of the debts of developing countries are owed to private commercial banks; the balance is owed to the governments of Western countries and international financial institutions.

What is the reason for the accumulation of such huge indebtedness? Also, what were the mechanisms of this process? Answers to both questions are related, above all, to the profound structural changes in the global capitalist economy, the beginning of which may be traced to the familiar events of the first half of the 1970s.

The investment boom in the developing countries, the tempestuous industrial construction in the 1970s, the transfer of many traditional sectors (such as metallurgy, some machine-building sectors, chemical and petrochemical, household electrical appliances and electronics and light industry) to the new parts of the world, the development of the energy and transportation infrastructure and the implementation of large social programs created a drastic increase in the needs of developing countries for financing, including from outside sources. However, the international conditions in the 1970s by no means always contributed to the implementation of such objectives, and in frequent cases even obstructed them. Governmental aid granted by the leading capitalist states to the young countries declined in relative terms; the influx of direct private investments slowed down and all efforts on the part of the developing countries to achieve a large-scale redistribution of global income within the framework of the movement for a new international economic order crashed against a thick wall of lack of understanding on the part of the West. At the same time, as a result of the double increase in world petroleum prices in 1973-1974 and 1979-1980, the current payment situation of petroleum-importing developing countries worsened sharply and it became physically impossible for most of them to settle their oil accounts without external financial help.

For the period from 1974 to 1982 the total balance of payments deficit of the developing countries exceeded \$450 billion. The only real means of covering the huge deficits of a number of developing countries was to borrow funds from international commercial banks, above all those operating on the European currency market where, at the beginning of the 1980s, more than \$1.5 trillion was in circulation. All in all, between the mid-1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, international commercial bank loans covered more than two-thirds of the total current deficits of the developing countries.

Increasing demand met with increasing offer. Operations on the European currency market are conducted in currencies foreign to the states in which such operations are conducted. It is primarily private investments on demand in national currency, converted into term deposits in foreign banks or foreign branches of national banks that are the sources of funds for this market. Said banks or foreign branches thus perform brokerage functions between foreign borrowers and domestic lenders. Short-term internal loans are

converted into medium-term international loans through the multinational banks operating on the European currency market.

Initially, the main reason for the establishment of a European currency market was the fact that numerous restrictions were imposed by several countries, the United States above all, on direct capital transfers abroad. The unparalleled inflation of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, which hindered long-term investments of national savings, including stocks and bonds, also considerably contributed to the growth of the European currency market, for the owners of liquid funds feared significant losses as a result of price increases and preferred to keep their assets in a relatively liquid short-term form, including European currency accounts. Another major factor for the expansion of the European currency market was a so-called process of "recycling" the income of the suddenly prosperous petroleum-extracting countries, whose economy could not absorb the entire income earned from petroleum exports. During that period the OPEC countries invested in the Western credit system more than \$400 billion. Today they account for some 20 percent of the funds circulating on the European currency market.

During that time the abundance of available short-term capital encouraged the banks maximally to intensify their activities in all areas, including the developing countries. Since the funds were borrowed essentially by the governments of these countries, confident that the "final guarantor" in this case would be the entire capitalist monetary system, these banks granted, as a rule, loans on demand, frequently not even showing an interest in their use. On the other hand, the low interest rates which prevailed during the second half of the 1970s (in real terms, averaging 1.5 percent annually, compared to 2-3 percent charged in the 1960s), encouraged the developing countries to borrow as much as possible in the hope that, in the final account, inflation would "eat up" a considerable percentage of such loans by the time they were due. Therefore, the current level of indebtedness of the developing countries is the overall result of their drastically increased financing requirements, the availability of huge funds seeking profitable investments, inflation and the low real interest rates which then prevailed on the world credit markets.

It would be extremely unfair to accuse such countries of irresponsibility, as is now being done in the West. "Some developing countries invested more in consumption than in production," states, for example, U.S. Secretary of State Shultz. Let us reemphasize that no other real solution was available to such countries during the 1970s. Estimates indicate that about 80 percent of the funds borrowed by developing petroleum importers between 1973 and 1982 were used to compensate for the higher petroleum prices, sharp fluctuations in their export earnings and servicing their growing indebtedness. Nor should we forget, however, that, in the final account, at least 20 percent of the funds they borrowed at that time went into production, i.e., new capital construction. Naturally, domestic accumulations played a decisive role in the relatively fast economic growth during the last decade. However, the influx of outside funds as well was of some importance. Characteristically, during that period the gross national product growth rates of the biggest borrowers in the developing countries--Mexico, Brazil, Venezuela, Nigeria and many others--averaged 6.5-7 percent annually, with export growth rates averaging 10-11 percent.

The devastating 1980-1982 crisis, which broke out in the main capitalist countries, drastically changed the entire situation. Global trade and, consequently, demand for commodities exported by the developing countries, dropped substantially. Protectionism in the leading capitalist countries increased, and raw material prices (with the exception of petroleum) dropped by 35 percent, reaching their lowest level in 30 years. Income from exports by the biggest debtors dropped by 25-30 percent. At the same time, as a result of the policy of the Reagan administration, interest rates on loans reached 7-10 percent in real figures in 1981-1982. During the crisis period the cost to the developing countries for interest alone owed to the United States and other Western countries more than tripled, exceeding \$66 billion in 1982. What worsened the situation further was the fact that repayment of the bulk of the loans came due in 1981-1984, and the principal which the developing countries had to repay increased to \$110-140 billion annually. The ratio of current loan payments (interest and principle) to export income increased roughly from 10 percent in the mid-1970s to 40 percent or more for the majority of developing countries. Naturally, most developing countries could not withstand such economic pressure. As U. Gut, Deutsches Bank president, pointed out, the existing situation had been triggered by the "cumulative effect of a protracted decline, excessive interest rates and the growing protectionism in the industrial world." The first signal of the debt crisis was marked by Mexico's failure to meet its payment in August 1982, followed by Brazil and several other countries. Bolivia recently announced its inability to pay. At the present time, talks on deferring repayments and new loans to service them are being conducted with more than 40 countries which account for the overwhelming majority of Third World indebtedness. Starting with the autumn of 1982, the governments of the leading Western countries, the multinational commercial banks, the Bank for International Settlements in Basel, the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development have been making feverish efforts somehow to ease the existing situation, to keep "afloat" their main debtors and to save the capitalist monetary system from an unbearable overstress. More than 20 "rescue" operations of the main debtors, involving a total indebtedness in excess of \$250 billion, were conducted in 1982-1983. The leading role in these operations was played by the coordinating activities of the International Monetary Fund and the pressure of Western governments on commercial banks, including small ones, with a view to encouraging them to continue to give credits to the developing countries in one way or another, either by deferring repayment or granting new loans to service the old ones and pay the interest due on them.

The principal motivation for such "rescuing" activities has been a kind of "balance of fear." "The primary task today," G. Schmidt, former FRG chancellor emphasized, "was to prevent the international credit chain from breaking." An official bankruptcy could not only become a catastrophe for one debtor country or another but would inevitably affect the interests of the lending countries. For example, the foreign assets of each of the seven largest American banks, including Chase Manhattan and Citicorp, exceed their own capital by a factor of 1.5-2; credits to the developing countries have been extended by now by more than 1,000 large and major U.S. commercial banks. The main principle for the "rescue" is for the debtor to make regular payments

on interest owed while the unrepaid principle (let us add, to the greater advantage to the lender, who will be earning profits over an extended period of time) may be essentially extended to infinity. In the majority of cases the basic technique for such a "rescue" is a new loan extended by the International Monetary Fund or the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, along with extensive loans granted by private banks on a parallel basis, something which has taken place no less than 4 times, for whom such international financial institutions act as a sort of final guarantor. It is precisely with a view to resolving the debt crisis that the lending resources of the International Monetary Fund were more than tripled in 1983.

Naturally, imperialism would not have been imperialism had it not tried to profit from the debt situation to tie to itself the developing countries financially even more strongly, and to force them to open their doors even more widely to the multinational corporations, to strengthen the economic foundations for their capitalist development and to deprive the working people in those countries of their social gains. The "structural reorganization" of the national economy of debtor countries, required by the International Monetary Fund, means above all a drop in production, cuts in industrial and consumer imports, dislocating the state sector, freezing important projects, offering new benefits to the multinational corporations and drastically lowering the level of population consumption and state expenditures in the social sector. In the case of Mexico, for example, which met all the requirements imposed by the IMF, this meant for 1983 a production decline by 4 percent, increased unemployment by a factor of 2.5, reduced real earnings by 22 percent, and applying more than 50 percent of income from exports to the repayment of the debt. It is not astounding that in many developing countries the IMF recommendations are met with stormy protests and a drastic increase in social tension, as was recently the case in Brazil, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic and Tunisia.

It would be interesting to see what would have happened had the prescriptions of the International Monetary Fund, already imposed on more than 40 countries, been applied to the United States, which is today essentially in a similar situation. As the Paris LE MONDE pointed out, "if the American administration were to apply to itself the same rigid rules which, in conjunction with the IMF, it is imposing on foreign countries mired in debt, the United States would have to force itself to have an annual budget surplus to reduce its internal and external indebtedness."

Naturally, extending repayment is not the final solution of the problem but a palliative, a temporary measure, for the indebtedness incurred by the developing countries is of a profoundly structural rather than short-term nature. Agreements on postponing it, which have somewhat eased the situation today, are, as O. Emminger, the noted West German banker notes, "merely the first phase or the first act of the indebtedness drama." The revision of debts may take place a number of times over many years. However, it cannot eliminate the need for new sources of financing which would ensure the economic progress of the developing countries.

It would be pertinent here to express several general considerations. First of all, we must obviously agree with the opinion of numerous Western

specialists, who proceed from the fact that the developing countries would be hardly able fully to repay their debts ever. Many of them have simply no physical possibility of repayment and it is doubtful that such possibilities will appear in the foreseeable future. Today, even such an extremely reactionary journal as AMERICAN OPINION is forced to acknowledge that "no one expects that the day will ever come when these funds will be repaid."

Secondly, although over the past 2 years the banks have drastically reduced their loans to developing countries, in the long run the leading Western countries (up to 40 percent of whose exports today go to those countries) have no alternative other than to continue to extend credit to the debtor countries, for otherwise they could undermine the foundations of a more or less stable economic growth of the lending countries themselves. The crisis of the 1980s, as BUSINESS WEEK pointed out, proved for the first time and most clearly that economic depression in the developing countries exerts a direct and tangible negative influence on the economy of the industrialized capitalist countries. Under such conditions, to reduce the absolute indebtedness of the developing countries is the equivalent of excising living flesh. The 1983-1984 situation, when the payments made by such countries of principal and interest exceeded the amount of new loans by nearly \$30 billion, benefitted neither side in the final account.

Thirdly, the "bomb of indebtedness" has become one of the most valid arguments against a continuation of the irresponsible policy conducted by the Reagan administration, including elements such as recurrences of protectionism, artificially high interest rates, siphoning off "for itself" available international capital, including that of developing countries, hindering the growth of the real possibilities of multilateral aid, etc.

Fourthly, another factor which would unquestionably reduce the debt stress is for productive capital investments, in the not so distant future, finally begin to yield economic returns in the developing countries. We should not forget, the American journal FOREIGN AFFAIRS emphasizes, that a considerable percentage of the loans were based on repayment in real income, "which has still not begun to be generated as rapidly as had been planned."

The inevitable question which remains, however, is the following: is it possible, even if only in principle, to find a total radical solution to the contemporary debt crisis in the capitalist world? Many plans have been drawn up in this connection. All of them, however, are as a rule utopian. For example, the developing countries are actively discussing the idea of collective debt moratorium. It is frequently forgotten, however, that loans to developing countries account for less than 10 percent of the assets of Western commercial banks. Should collective bankruptcy be declared, in the final account (and, naturally, with the help of their governments) the banks would be able somehow to survive the loss. However, would the developing countries themselves benefit from this? This is hardly likely, for the real consequence of such bankruptcy would be a termination of most exports and imports, loss of foreign assets, dried-up sources of foreign financing, etc. According to most specialists, equally unrealistic is the idea of exchanging the debts of developing countries for IMF and IBRD bonds, for the reason alone

that no effective means exist so far to force the government of the main imperialist lending countries to accept this idea.

Politics is inseparably linked with economics in the contemporary world, a tie which will become even stronger with time. We believe that a purely economic solution to the problem of international indebtedness is hardly possible at all. The most radical method for the release of substantial funds needed in settling the international indebtedness problem is detente, disarmament and a drastic reduction of the military budgets of all countries. Currently, in a single year, the world is spending on an insane arms race nearly the full amount of indebtedness of the developing countries. It is precisely in this area that we can see with particular clarity the extent to which the current policy pursued by imperialism is aimed against the basic interests of mankind and its peaceful development, stability and prosperity, and the extent to which the peace-loving policy of socialist countries is consistent with the basic needs and aspirations of the peoples the world over.

The position held by the socialist states concerning the international problem of indebtedness was clearly presented at the June 1984 Moscow Summit Economic Conference of CEMA Member Countries. The declaration issued at the conference emphasized that the CEMA countries "call for bringing order in monetary relations. They oppose the policy of high interest rates and favor normalizing loan granting and repayment conditions so that such conditions, particularly in terms of the indebtedness of developing countries, may not be used as instruments of political pressure and interference in domestic affairs."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/10

REGULAR ENROLLMENT IN REPUBLIC AND INTEROBLAST HIGHER PARTY SCHOOLS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 85 (signed to press 27 Feb 85) p 128

[Text] The following is a notice for the regular enrollment of students in republic and interoblast higher party schools. Students will be accepted on the basis of recommendations issued by union republic communist party central committees and party kraykoms and obkoms.

The higher party schools will accept party, soviet, Komsomol and ideological workers who have been members of the CPSU for no less than 3 years, as follows:

For 2-year departments and 3-year correspondence departments--higher school graduates under 40 years of age;

4-year departments and 5-year correspondence departments--secondary school graduates no older than 35 years of age.

By no later than 1 March 1985, the central committees of communist parties of union republics and party kraykoms and obkoms will submit to the higher party schools excerpts from bureau decrees, character certificates and corresponding documents of recommended candidates.

Those recommended for the 2-year departments and 3-year correspondence departments will be invited to the higher party schools for an interview and those entering the 4-year departments and 5-year correspondence departments, for taking entrance examinations on the foundations of Marxism-Leninism, Russian language (composition) and USSR history (secondary school level) between 10 April and 1 May 1985.

Those recommended for training shall be granted a 2-week paid leave to prepare for and take the entrance examinations.

Classes at higher party schools will begin on 1 September.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/10

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

18 JUNE 85